

Robert E. Slocum to be postmaster at Pharr, Tex., in place of R. E. Slocum. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

Thomas B. White to be postmaster at Rogers, Tex., in place of T. B. White. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

Merrida E. Ware to be postmaster at Seagraves, Tex., in place of M. C. Ware, deceased.

Royce E. Dowdy to be postmaster at Trent, Tex., in place of R. E. Dowdy. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1930.

John F. Warrington to be postmaster at Valley Mills, Tex., in place of J. F. Warrington. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

#### VIRGINIA

David A. Sergent to be postmaster at Big Stone Gap, Va., in place of H. H. Slomp. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1929.

Roland L. Somers to be postmaster at Bloxom, Va., in place of R. L. Somers. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

Silverius C. Hall to be postmaster at Hallwood, Va., in place of S. C. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

William P. Nye, jr., to be postmaster at Radford, Va., in place of W. P. Nye, jr. Incumbent's commission expires May 4, 1930.

George N. Kirk to be postmaster at St. Charles, Va., in place of G. N. Kirk. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Herbert T. Thomas to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Va., in place of H. T. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires May 4, 1930.

#### WASHINGTON

Joseph A. Dean to be postmaster at Castle Rock, Wash., in place of J. A. Dean. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

Arthur H. Eldredge to be postmaster at Colfax, Wash., in place of A. H. Eldredge. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1930.

Carl J. Gunderson to be postmaster at East Stanwood, Wash., in place of C. J. Gunderson. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Nelson J. Crague to be postmaster at Everett, Wash., in place of N. J. Crague. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Jay Faris to be postmaster at Grandview, Wash., in place of C. E. Haasze, removed.

Wayne L. Talkington to be postmaster at Harrington, Wash., in place of W. L. Talkington. Incumbent's commission expires May 5, 1930.

Amy E. Ide to be postmaster at Outlook, Wash., in place of A. E. Ide. Incumbent's commission expires May 5, 1930.

Ernest C. Day to be postmaster at Palouse, Wash., in place of R. H. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Lewis Murphy to be postmaster at Republic, Wash., in place of Lewis Murphy. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Thomas B. Southard to be postmaster at Willsoncreek, Wash., in place of R. H. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Herman L. Leeper to be postmaster at Yakima, Wash., in place of H. L. Leeper. Incumbent's commission expires May 5, 1930.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

John O. Stone to be postmaster at Davy, W. Va., in place of J. O. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

#### WISCONSIN

Paul W. Schuette to be postmaster at Ableman, Wis., in place of P. W. Schuette. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

George E. Grob to be postmaster at Auburndale, Wis., in place of G. E. Grob. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Leslie D. Jenkins to be postmaster at Bagley, Wis., in place of L. D. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Leslie H. Thayer to be postmaster at Birchwood, Wis., in place of L. H. Thayer. Incumbent's commission expires May 4, 1930.

Paul E. Kleist to be postmaster at Hustisford, Wis., in place of F. A. Roeseler. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Carlton C. Good to be postmaster at Neshkoro, Wis., in place of C. C. Good. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1930.

Wallace M. Comstock to be postmaster at Oconto, Wis., in place of W. M. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Edith Best to be postmaster at Prairie Farm, Wis., in place of Edith Best. Incumbent's commission expires May 29, 1930.

John E. Wehrman to be postmaster at Prescott, Wis., in place of J. E. Wehrman. Incumbent's commission expires May 20, 1930.

Clara H. Schmitz to be postmaster at St. Cloud, Wis., in place of C. H. Schmitz. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Donald C. McDowell to be postmaster at Soldiers Grove, Wis., in place of D. C. McDowell. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

Charles A. Arnot to be postmaster at South Wayne, Wis., in place of C. A. Arnot. Incumbent's commission expires May 21, 1930.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, April 29, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*I will never leave thee nor forsake thee; I will go with thee all the way.*

When out in the wilderness alone, when bereft of friends and of fortune, when compassed with grief and with gloom, merciful Father, no words could be as comforting. Thy providential care towers above the forbidding horizons of all human need. We thank Thee for Thy promises. Inspire us with their loftiest heights of spiritual exaltation, with the widest sweep of their conquering might, and with their largest breadth of their catholicity. Bless our country with all its leaders. Preserve them from perplexing doubt and perilous drift. Let righteous assertion, patriotic zeal, and good will ring cheerily from border to border and from coast to coast. In the name of the world's Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3441) entitled "An act to effect the consolidation of the Turkey Thicket Playground, Recreation and Athletic Field."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3059, An act to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of certain public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression; and

S. 3061, An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday. Of course, I do not know at this time when the business of Calendar Wednesday will be disposed of, but following the disposition of business to-morrow by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which they wish to bring up, if they close within a reasonable time, I should like to have one hour to conduct a kind of round-table discussion on the economics of the export debenture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the disposition of matters in charge of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he may be permitted to address the House for one hour on the subject of the export debenture. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, that is after the disposition of Calendar Wednesday business?

The SPEAKER. After the disposition of all matters brought up by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain a little further what he means by a round-table discussion? Does the gentleman mean he is to occupy the hour or that we all may get into this scrap?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, after I have discussed the economics, and as I go along with the discussion of the economics, if Members wish to ask questions I will be very pleased, indeed, to yield for such question.

Mr. SNELL. A kind of general discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ARTICLE BY HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a series of articles recently written by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Mr. LINDSAY WARREN, which I think are of great literary merit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing some articles written by his colleague, Mr. WARREN, of North Carolina. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] has recently written a series of historical articles, appearing in the Raleigh News and Observer, that have attracted state-wide interest and comment. They deal with the most interesting period of North Carolina history and show deep study and research and are regarded as an outstanding and notable contribution of historical and literary effort. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting these valuable articles in the RECORD, including an editorial on same by Josephus Daniels.

[Editorial Raleigh News and Observer, December 18, 1929]

LINDSAY C. WARREN, HISTORIAN

The first of one of the best series of articles the News and Observer has offered its readers in a long time appears on another page this morning. It is Congressman LINDSAY WARREN's story of Beaufort County's contribution to a notable era of the State's history.

Mr. WARREN in the rôle of lawyer and legislator the readers of the News and Observer know very well. It is fair to say that in the rôle of historian they will soon know him just as favorably. He has the faculty for digging into the past for significant details of events and also has the ability to write about them and about the men who participated in them interestingly. If you read nothing else in the paper this morning, read, by all means, this article by Congressman WARREN.

The articles in the series deal with that period of the State's history from 1845 to 1875, and are built up around the great ante and post bellum bar of Washington, composed of Edward Stanly, Richard S. Donnell, Edward J. Warren, Thomas Sparrow, William B. Rodman, Fenner B. Satterthwaite, and David M. Carter. All of these seven men were leading figures of their times. Mr. WARREN is a grandson of Judge Edward J. Warren.

The articles deal with the great political battles before the War between the States; the secession and several constitutional conventions; Washington during the war; the arrest of Mayor Isaiah Respass; the return of Stanly as Lincoln's provisional governor; the convention of 1868, and the work of Judge Rodman in that body; Judge "Jay Bird" Jones on the superior court bench; the Holden impeachment and the election of Vance. The county of Beaufort has always played an influential rôle in the legislative, constitutional, and judicial history of North Carolina, and these articles vividly portray her leaders in a trying period.

#### BEAUFORT COUNTY'S CONTRIBUTION TO A NOTABLE ERA OF NORTH CAROLINA HISTORY

By Congressman LINDSAY C. WARREN

##### CHAPTER I

The county of Beaufort in the 225 years of its existence has always played a commanding rôle in the history of the Commonwealth. There have been periods when its leaders rose to great heights and left their indelible impress.

Settled exclusively by the English, its trials and tribulations as an important section of the colony go hand in hand with the rebellion against colonial rule and the unconquerable desire for independence. Undaunted by the Indian massacres of the early days, which almost took her last man, the county rose nobly to the cause of the Revolution, sending more than her quota of fighting men, and furnishing from her great estates even the family plate brought from England. Two of her great public leaders stood out in these times—Col. James Bonner and John Gray Blount. The former commanded the Beaufort County Militia and was preeminent as a man and as a soldier. The latter as a boy from a distinguished family, seeking adventure, had accompanied Daniel Boone as a chain bearer in his pilgrimage to Kentucky, and during the administration of Thomas Jefferson was to become one of the largest individual landowners in America. It was these two men who molded the sentiment and policy of the county in that early day. For the next 40 years, beginning with the accession of Jefferson, the sons of these men as well as other prominent figures came on the scene, and Beaufort County sat high in the councils of the State. It is my intent at some other time to treat of this period.

The purpose of these articles is to portray, historically correctly, I trust, some of the happenings of that great era in North Carolina from 1845 to 1875 and to bring forth again those men who became dominant actors and who either lived in Beaufort County at the time or who were closely identified with it. Certainly no period in our history could be more interesting. They were the halcyon days before the war, and then the dreags and despair that followed it. Beaufort County shared in its pleasures, drank deep in its sorrows, and contributed greatly in its reconstruction.

For 40 years before the War between the States, Washington was a pleasure-loving but ambitious community. It was a port of no small repute. Out over the bar of Ocracoke Inlet to the West Indies, and

northern points, went the fleet of Fowle ships carrying lumber and returning with merchandise, fruits, and molasses. Commerce teemed in the harbor and the docks were a busy scene. It was a day of large plantations, high living, fast horses, hard drinking, and political strife. The first day of court was always a gala affair, and set aside for political discussion. Any orator could get a crowd. The social reputation of the community was widely known. The people were hospitable to their hurt, and entertained lavishly. The slaves did the work. But withal, there was culture and refinement in the homes, and many of them were centers of attraction for learned people.

An outstanding event in its social life had been in 1819, when the town was visited by President James Monroe and his Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun. It was occasion for great celebration, the distinguished guests being met a few miles from town by a cavalcade of 100 citizens. Cannon boomed out the presidential salute. They were escorted to the courthouse lawn where the President spoke to thousands. That night, a dance, graced by ladies and gentlemen in resplendent dress, culminated the entertainment, Mr. Monroe taking part in the festivities and making himself most agreeable.

The town was included in the itineraries of many of the prominent men of the day, who came here to consult the great leaders and enjoy the social life. In the summer of 1836, Washington was visited by one of her native sons in the person of Hon. Churchill C. Cambreleng. He was born there but moved to New York City at the age of 16, and subsequently engaged there in the mercantile business. He was elected to Congress as a Tammany Democrat and served for 18 years. At the time of his visit to Washington he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, enjoyed the friendship and confidence of Jackson, and had always been a tower of strength to him in his fight on the bank. Mr. Cambreleng spoke at Washington advocating the election of his close friend, Mr. Van Buren, but Beaufort County voted heavily against his candidate in the election. Two years later he was defeated for Congress and Van Buren thereupon appointed him as minister to Russia, where he served with great distinction. Judge Stephen C. Bragaw is one of his relatives and bears the name of his brother.

A discussion of the men and measures of the age beginning in 1845 necessarily must be woven around the legal fraternity. At that time politics was an exalted profession and the bar, on account of their educational qualifications, were looked to by the people as leaders of thought and exponents of issues. For 125 years the bar of Washington has been without a superior in the legal history of the State. The statement is made advisedly, but with knowledge of the groups that practiced there in each decade. Certainly this was true in the early fifties, when Edward Stanly, Thomas Sparrow, Edward J. Warren, William B. Rodman, Fenner B. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Donnell, and David M. Carter took their seats at the counsel tables in the same courthouse at Washington that stands to-day. Of this bar only William B. Rodman was born in Beaufort County. Aside from being a good place to live, there was considerable litigation in the county, and men like Stanly and Donnell forsook their native Craven and moved there.

In 1846 there came to Washington from the hills of his native Vermont a young man 20 years of age from a long line of Massachusetts ancestry. He had just graduated with high distinction from Dartmouth College, founded by his maternal ancestor, Doctor Wheelock. His name was Edward Jenner Warren. Tall, broad breasted, muscular, and erect, in appearance he was the acme of physical manhood, but the rigors of the cold northern climate had already affected him and he was moved to seek a milder temperature. He was a part of that migration of young men from New England that came south in the early forties. All were graduates of Tufts, Dartmouth, Yale, or Harvard, and they settled in Elizabeth City, Washington, and in Wilmington, N. C., and in Charleston, S. C. The South was still in the prime of her importance in the life of the Nation, and these young men, some as lawyers, some as physicians, and others as school-teachers, came seeking their opportunity and marrying into the older families. President Coolidge once told the writer that he became greatly interested in the southward trek of these able young men from his section during that period and used it as his subject when addressing the New England Society of Charleston when he was Vice President.

Edward J. Warren came as a school-teacher, finding time in his spare moments to read law, and was admitted to the bar in 1848. He shortly married Deborah Virginia Bonner, daughter of Col. Richard Bonner, a member of the council of state, long influential and powerful in affairs and the largest planter and wealthiest man in Beaufort County. Fresh from Dartmouth, still haunted by the memories of Webster, young Warren made him his political ideal, espoused both his cause and his theories and frequently corresponded with him. He cast his first vote in North Carolina for the Whig candidate, and within three years became outstanding as one of the younger Whig leaders. His early training and environment, the friendship of his Revolutionary ancestors with Washington and the Adamses, his admiration for Webster, and his hatred of the nullification doctrine of Calhoun gave him all of the requisites for a virile leadership in a section which was already in sympathy with his beliefs.

But from the beginning he was essentially a lawyer. His contemporaries at the bar scintillated with brilliance, both in the knowledge



of the law and the powers of oratory. It was no local reputation these men had. As lawyers they rode the circuit of the eastern courts and each established himself. The old court minute books of the East attest their appearances and their hard-fought victories and defeats. Each had his special attainments, but in knowledge of the law all were profound.

"In Warren," wrote one of them, "the soft and tender seemed to find no lodgement in his composition, but the noble and generous, in fullest measure, made large reparation for their absence." He was lofty and austere and socially was retiring and unconvivial but loved the company of a few chosen friends, and with them, like Doctor Johnson, would indulge in "elephantine jocularity." He was an accomplished scholar and literatus.

Edward Stanly, born in New Bern, and a graduate of Norwich University, possessed all the force as well as logic that is generally given an able man. In his younger days he was hot-headed and ill-tempered and promptly met on the dueling ground a Member of the House from Alabama over an imaginary insult, but which resulted in no harm to either. But in his latter days Mr. Stanly calmed.

Thomas Sparrow, likewise born in New Bern, had graduated with great distinction at Princeton, being the valedictorian of his class and receiving from that great institution both his A. B. and master's degrees. He read law under Judge Gaston, and moved to Washington and formed a partnership with Stanly. He was a profound student, and a forceful debater and orator. His appealing personality gathered men around him.

Richard S. Donnell was also born in New Bern. He was a graduate of the University of North Carolina and of Yale, and was a grandson of Gov. Richard Dobbs Speight. He was a man of commanding appearance, quick and decisive in his actions, and thorough in the preparation of his cases. He was a clear thinker and went to the heart of every problem.

William Blount Rodman, a grandson of John Gray Blount, was born in Washington, and educated at the university. He was small of stature and rather rotund. He was a fluent speaker, possessing a concise and analytical mind and knew the history of his State such as few men did. Later as a writer of legal history he had few superiors.

David M. Carter was nearly 6 feet tall and of large frame. He was born in Hyde County and attended the university. He had red hair and blue eyes, and at times an ungovernable temper. When in a rage, his countenance was ugly beyond description. He was a good hater. To his friends he was as true as steel. He detested his enemies. He was as brave as a lion. He was a powerful, ruthless advocate who brooked no opposition. After the war he formed a partnership with Mr. Warren.

Fenner B. Satterthwaite lived just over the line in Pitt County, but practiced in Washington regularly and moved there after the war. He had a natural gift for the law. He rarely cracked a book, but depended on his commanding appearance and striking personality, his knowledge of the people, and his ability to speak. And quite successful was he.

Such was the bar of Washington in 1850. There was not a case brought in Beaufort County that these men were not pitted against each other, and at every courthouse in the eastern country where they appeared, one or more of them would arise and address his fellow citizens on the issues of the day. Warren, Stanly, Sparrow, Donnell, Satterthwaite, and Carter were Whigs, while Rodman carried the Democratic banner alone. Beaufort was a Whig county. In the earlier days it had stood by General Jackson, but it had annihilated Van Buren, Polk, Cass, Pierce, and Buchanan. Its members of the legislature had been Whigs, and the county always loyally supported Morehead and Graham.

In 1853, after five years at the bar and at the age of 27, Mr. Warren rose to great heights in his profession in the case of the State against the Rev. George Washington Carrawan, a Baptist minister of great influence, from Hyde County, owning large tracts of land and a number of slaves. He had killed a school-teacher from Perquimans County named Lassiter, and though Carrawan's slave had aided his master in disposing of the body, his evidence was incompetent and the case was built up solely on circumstances. It was removed to Beaufort County and Messrs. Warren and Carter appeared with the solicitor, Mr. Stevenson, of New Bern, while Messrs. Rodman, Satterthwaite, Donnell, and James W. Bryan defended. Mr. Stevenson placed Mr. Warren in charge of the case, and he accordingly made the last argument to the jury. Judge Bailey presided. It will go down as one of the great criminal trials of America, consuming eight days and becoming famous on account of the arguments and the immediate happenings after the verdict.

When the jury brought in a verdict of murder in the first degree (Carrawan had turned to his wife after Mr. Warren concluded his speech and said, "That speech hangs me"), the prisoner, arising to be sentenced, calmly took a pistol from his pocket, aimed it deliberately at Mr. Warren, and fired. He was attired in the conventional broadcloth of the day, with heavy cardboard in the lapels of his coat. A large gold chain was thrown across his chest, holding a locket hanging just over his heart. The bullet struck the locket, caromed to his lapel, cutting out the cardboard, and, falling to the floor, left him uninjured.

The shock knocked him down, but he was quickly on his feet, and in time to see Carrawan draw another pistol and kill himself in the court room. Judge Bailey wrote: "The calmness and poise of Mr. Warren under such a severe ordeal was the most remarkable thing I have ever witnessed." The speeches made by Messrs. Rodman and Warren in that case, outstanding for legal argument and oratorical ability, are published in a work well known to lawyers as *Classics of the Bar*. The complete history of the trial was written at the time by Mr. Sparrow, who did not appear. There is a copy in the Supreme Court Library, and the few that are still preserved are much sought after.

It was during this period that events began to shape themselves that unerringly pointed to secession. The eighth congressional district at that time was composed of the counties of Beaufort, Craven, Lenoir, Pitt, Greene, Tyrrell, Hyde, Washington, Carteret, Wayne, and Jones. For years it had been overwhelmingly Whig, and its leaders were standing squarely with Webster and Clay. The district was so pro-Union that the opposition to the dominant party was negligible. Mr. Stanly had served three terms in Congress with great ability, but in 1842 had been defeated for reelection. He returned home and was immediately sent to the house of commons from Beaufort County for four terms, was speaker in 1846, and the next year was the attorney general of the State.

In 1848 he was again elected to Congress and served until 1853. Mr. Donnell, at the age of 26, having voluntarily retired after serving one term, and insisting that Mr. Stanly take the Whig nomination. The district had been taking no chance that anyone who subscribed to the South Carolina doctrine should represent it. But with the increased activity of Beecher, Garrison, and Mrs. Stowe in the North, the seeds of disunion were germinating even in conservative and Union-loving North Carolina; and the Democrats, taking advantage of the mistakes of the Fillmore administration, set about to seize the Whig stronghold, the eighth district. Mr. Stanly had previously announced his retirement at the expiration of his term but yielded to the importunities of his party and again became the candidate.

Months before the election the Democrats nominated Thomas Ruffin, of Wayne. Mr. Sparrow, as chairman of the district Whig committee, became the manager of his law partner's campaign and lost no time in launching it. In a ringing appeal to the voters, prepared and signed by him as chairman, along with Col. Edward C. Yellowley, of Pitt, Jones Spencer, of Hyde, and others, he roundly denounced Mr. Ruffin and said that he was already "a warm and open advocate of the right of secession." He warned that the election might be thrown in the House of Representatives and asked, "Who shall cast your vote for President of the United States—Edward Stanly, a Union Whig, or Thomas Ruffin, a locofoco secessionist?"

The appeal to the electorate further continued:

"The abolitionists and Free Soilers at the North and the secessionists of the South are both laboring for directly opposite reasons to destroy the Union. They continue to agitate. They live only by agitation. The compromise measures adopted by the last Congress were regarded by the great and good men, both North and South, as 'a settlement, a final settlement of the dangerous and exciting subjects they embraced.'"

"The abolitionists and secessionists continue to assail these measures. The wise and patriotic policy of our conservative Whig President is bitterly denounced. South Carolina is on the eve of disunion. Finding no other State to join her, she threatens to secede alone. Nullification and secession, odious always and crushed in 1833 by General Jackson, have been revived. If this doctrine is right, then South Carolina is right and our Government is wrong. If Stanly is defeated it will be proclaimed in all the land as a South Carolina victory in Stanly's district, in Union-loving North Carolina."

It was a great campaign. Sparrow, Warren, Carter, and Donnell took the stump for Stanly, all denouncing secession and breathing devotion to the Union. But Ruffin was elected and the Whig power in the district was at last broken. Beaufort County went for Stanly. Mr. Ruffin remained in Congress and went out when the State seceded. He was killed in one of the battles in northern Virginia. In 1853 Mr. Stanly moved to California, where he practiced law. His party, having passed off the scene of action, he allied himself with the rising new Republican Party and was their unsuccessful candidate for Governor of California in 1857. North Carolina was to hear no more of him until five years later.

It was in 1859 that Mr. Warren wrote a powerful article for the New York Tribune, which drew from Horace Greeley a lengthy editorial. At that time Mr. Greeley was saying, "Let them go in peace." It drew the fire of both the rabid abolitionists and the hot-headed secessionists. It was a restatement of the old Clay policies, and pleaded with the sober sense of the North not to make it harder for both southern Whigs and Democrats who loved the Union to keep up their fight. By this time Mr. Warren had formed an intimate friendship with Governor Graham, and they constantly consulted.

After serving as Representative from Beaufort in 1858, Thomas Sparrow moved to Arcola, Ill., where, on account of his ability, a wide field of activity had been promised him, but with the war clouds gathering and feeling then the inevitability of the approaching conflict, he

sorrowfully turned his way home within a year. But the lovers of the Union were not yet giving up. By this time Mr. Rodman was openly advocating secession, was writing prolifically, and making powerful speeches. Carter, Warren, Donnell, and Sparrow were making themselves heard, and wherever one spoke he was greeted with large crowds. Mr. Satterthwaite, living then in Pitt County, was quiet, but his near neighbor, Bryan Grimes, was using his great influence for dissolution. In the winter of 1861 the question of a convention was submitted to the voters of the State. The cotton States had gone out. On every stump in Beaufort County the question was argued. The people were at fever heat, but they were urged to vote down the call. Beaufort County did. And the State did. North Carolina was still in the Union.

But events were happening fast. Lincoln had made his call for troops. Virginia had seceded, and the war was already on. The next election on a convention was held. This time they were all together, all favoring it, and Beaufort County giving it a large majority along with the rest of the State. At the same time Edward J. Warren and William J. Ellison were elected as the county's delegates. Mr. Ellison was a large landowner and engaged in many business pursuits. He also was a Whig and strong Union man, and exerted tremendous influence in the county.

The personnel of the secession convention has been paid due tribute by the historians and writers. Certainly there has never been a greater or abler body of men gathered together in the history of the State, for in the crises North Carolina sent her best. The great county of Pitt sent Bryan Grimes and Fenner B. Satterthwaite, Mr. Grimes reproaching his friend and neighbor, Mr. Satterthwaite, a few days before the convention assembled, because he did not seem to have the same ardor that he did. Martin County sent Asa Biggs, then a United States judge, and one of the State's ablest men. Hyde sent Edward L. Mann. Washington sent William S. Pettigrew. Northampton sent her able judge, David A. Barnes, and John M. Moody. On the vote for president of the convention, Messrs. Warren, Ellison, and Satterthwaite voted for Gov. William A. Graham, who was defeated by the venerable Weldon N. Edwards. Mr. Grimes voted for Edwards. After a few preliminary roll calls as to its form, the ordinance of secession was unanimously passed, the 115 members signing the enrolled parchment. North Carolina had gone out of the Union and then quickly ratified the constitution of the Confederate States.

For the duration of the war, at least, the old antagonists at the bar and in politics made their peace. Mr. Sparrow raised a volunteer company in Beaufort County. While stationed at Portsmouth, awaiting transportation to northern Virginia, he was ordered to take his company to assist in the defense of Fort Hatteras. He was surrendered there with the garrison, and was in a northern prison for six months until exchanged. He was then called to Fort Fisher and was made a major. When that last great fort of the Confederacy fell, he was at home on sick leave. In a small canoe he paddled alone 20 miles down Pamlico River, and never surrendered or took the oath of allegiance.

On May 16, 1861, Mr. Carter was commissioned as captain of Company E, Fourth North Carolina Regiment, and went quickly to the front. At the Battle of Seven Pines, May 31, 1862, his regiment suffered severely, and he himself received wounds that were deemed fatal at the time. It was weeks before he sufficiently recovered to report for duty, and was then assigned as judge of Jackson's corps and made lieutenant colonel. Later he was presiding judge of the Third Army Corps (A. P. Hill's). He remained in the army until he was called home by his election to the legislature.

Mr. Rodman also raised a volunteer company of heavy artillery, which saw service in several sections. Later he was made president of a military court which held sessions in different parts of the South. Mr. Satterthwaite was not in the army, but gave three sons to the cause. Mr. Donnell was in the legislature during the period of the war and was elected to the convention upon the death of Mr. Ellison and also to the convention of 1865.

Immediately after signing the ordinance of secession Mr. Warren was unanimously elected as captain of a cavalry company organized by his friends in the east. A similar company had been organized in another section, and it was decided to only commission one of them. Governor Clark appointed the other man, Mr. Warren always feeling that the governor had been actuated in his decision because they were political opponents. Later, when the entire convention tendered their services to the Confederacy, Mr. Warren was rejected on account of his physical condition. A brother who had remained in New England served in a Massachusetts regiment, while one who came South served in a Georgia Regiment. They faced at Chickamauga, and the southerner was killed.

The brilliant career of Bryan Grimes, who was inseparably connected with the life of Beaufort County, needs no elaboration in these articles.

#### CHAPTER II

Edward J. Warren and William J. Ellison played important rôles in the convention of 1861 and from the beginning were continuously pointing out the value of eastern Carolina to the future of the Confederacy, condemning the half-hearted efforts for its defense by the Davis government, and urging State action. Both of them actively

participated in all of the proceedings and impressed the membership with their ability and courage. During its third session Mr. Ellison died, and Richard S. Donnell was elected to sit with Mr. Warren.

In 1858 Mr. Donnell had made his first legislative bow by serving as senator from Beaufort, and in 1860 he was one of the representatives from the county in the house of commons. He also served in that body at the sessions of 1862, 1864, and 1865, and was speaker both in 1862 and 1864. His great ability and fine legal training made him at once a leading State figure.

Mr. Warren was elected as senator from Beaufort in 1862, 1864, and 1865. In the convention of 1865-66 Messrs. Warren and Donnell were again the delegates from the county; so they served in the dual capacity as members of the convention and as members of the legislature. Mr. Donnell's colleague from Beaufort in the house of 1862 and 1864 was Col. David M. Carter. In both conventions sat Fenner B. Satterthwaite, then living in Pitt, and Jesse R. Stubbs sat in the latter convention from Martin. He was the father of Hon. Harry W. Stubbs, and for many years prior to the war was a representative from Beaufort, but had moved over into Martin. In 1866 he was elected to Congress, but the Thad Stevens régime would not let him be seated.

Mr. Warren was chairman of the judiciary committee during all of his terms in the senate and Mr. Donnell served in the same capacity in the house until he was elected speaker. Certainly no county in those strenuous times occupied a more powerful position in the legislative history of the State than Beaufort. Her senator, representatives, and members of the two conventions wielded tremendous influence, and Warren, Donnell, and Carter were giants in those bodies.

For the time being a new era began in North Carolina when on September 8, 1862, Zebulon B. Vance took the oath of office as governor, and a star of the first magnitude started its ascendancy. From that date until his death there was the closest personal and political friendship existing between Governor Vance and Mr. Warren. He soon appointed Mr. Warren as one of his council, and he became a recognized spokesman for the administration in the legislature.

During the progress of the war Governor Graham, Mr. Warren, Richard S. Donnell, Col. David M. Carter, and many others, were at times caustic critics of the Richmond government, and many of the war measures proposed both in the Confederate congress and in the legislature. They insisted upon a "vigorous constitutional war policy," but protested throughout, both in speeches and resolutions, "against any settlement of the struggle which does not secure the entire independence of the Confederate States of America."

The speech of William A. Graham against test oaths, sedition laws, disregard of constitutional guaranties, and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus was one of the greatest expositions ever delivered in any legislative body on the face of the earth. Mr. Warren followed him in a speech that was widely commended by those who loved constitutional liberty. But they were criticized—Vance, Graham, and Warren—all being subjects of harsh Richmond editorials.

In 1863, when it looked like the railroad would be seized by the Union forces, and when Governor Vance, without avail, had exhausted his patience in urging President Davis to protect it, he was forced to go so far as to threaten to bring back North Carolina troops from Virginia for that purpose. Of course, the Confederacy was harassed, and was, no doubt, exerting every effort, but North Carolina was its backbone and was crying to it in vain for relief.

Debate on the lack of defense for the railroad broke out with fury in the legislature, and Governor Vance was highly commended for his actions. On June 3, 1863, Gen. D. H. Hill reported to the Secretary of War at Richmond:

"Mr. Warren, of Beaufort, one of the governor's council, said in a speech in the legislature that if the enemy got possession of the railroad it would be time for North Carolina to decide to whom her allegiance was due, the United States or the Confederate Government."

Strong language this was, and uttered with the same force by many others, but it caused the railroad to be protected. These men were not only demanding that their State be safeguarded on account of the host she had placed in the field but they were telling the world that in North Carolina constitutional guaranties meant something. The popular conception to-day is against such a conduct of a war, but no war governor in history has ever upheld these sacred rights more than did Zebulon B. Vance. As in later years many of these same men placed their feet on the neck of a tyrant who was usurping the liberties of the people and cast him from office, they were then insisting that orderly processes of government be respected.

Abraham Lincoln never had a more severe critic than Mr. Warren. In his frequent correspondence with his friend, Mr. W. H. Willard, also of Washington, one of the largest merchants and manufacturers in the State, and the father-in-law of Capt. S. A. Ashe, Mr. Warren continually voiced his opinions of Lincoln, condemning him for bringing on a war without the consent of Congress, and exhorting his methods. "It would be odious," said he, "to live under a government presided over by a man who has utter contempt for the Constitution." In another, he called it "Lincoln's war," and in another he said, "You and I did not believe in the right of secession, but I had



no reluctance in voting for the ordinance when I saw Abraham Lincoln ruthlessly trampling the Constitution under foot."

But let us turn back to the home of Donnell, Sparrow, Rodman, Carter, and Warren and see how things were going on. None of them could go back there now, for on March 20, 1862, a week after the capture of New Bern by the Federals, the Twenty-fourth Massachusetts entered Washington, accompanied by a fleet of gunboats. At this time the town had been completely evacuated by the Confederates and no resistance was offered. The regimental band accompanied by several companies marched from the dock to the courthouse and raised the American flag. A banner alleged to have been placed there by citizens was stretched across Main Street, bearing the inscription, "The Union and the Constitution." The Federal commander reported to the War Department that he had found Union sentiments among a few individuals. A garrison, consisting of infantry, cavalry, and artillery, was brought in and made permanent. A large fleet of gunboats was anchored in the river off the town. The occupation was continuous until the spring of 1864.

On September 6, 1862, the Confederates, under General Martin, made an attempt to recapture the town, coming in and taking possession of the western section. The streets were swept by artillery fire, the opposing guns being within a block of each other. Both sides had a large number of killed and wounded. The Confederates retired after an all-day battle, when Union reinforcements came up. It was during this battle that the Union gunboat *Pickett* blew up in the river just in front of the writer's home, killing her captain and 19 of her crew, and wounding 6. The old wreck may be seen to-day. The Union gunboat *Louisiana* shelled the town during this engagement for six hours, not a house in a radius of seven blocks escaping her fire.

When Federal occupation came, there were not over 700 people who remained in Washington, all of them being old people who were noncombatants, and a few children. The feeling was prevalent that the section was being handed over to the tender mercies of the invaders, and that the Richmond government was stripping North Carolina of her manpower for service in Virginia. Hearts less loyal would have utterly failed. The county had always loved the Union, but when the step to leave it was taken, bickerings ceased, and a united front was presented.

On March 30, 1863, the Confederates, under Gen. D. H. Hill, began the siege for the relief of the town. Unfortunately, he had no gunboats, and as a result the Union garrison was constantly relieved. The besieging force consisted of the brigades of Daniel and Pettigrew on the south side of Pamlico River, and the brigade of Garnett, of Pickett's division, upon the north side. The force under General Hill numbered about 9,000. The Confederates seized the forts below the town and held in check a large fleet of Union gunboats attempting to pass them. The Federal garrison in the town at the beginning of the siege numbered 1,500, which was increased to 2,000 when the transports ran the blockade.

The Federals marched overland from New Bern with a force of 8,000 under General Spinola, but were met by Pettigrew at Blounts Creek and driven back. Fearing to make a land assault with its consequent loss of life, the Confederates daily engaged the Union gunboats and forts, and Washington was again riddled with shells. On April 15 a large part of the Confederate forces were called to Virginia, and the siege was abandoned. Washington was to remain under Federal occupation for another year.

The brilliant feat of General Hoke in capturing Plymouth on April 20, 1864, caused General Harland, the Union commander at Washington, to receive an order to evacuate the town. On April 30 the last Federal troops, after firing the different portions of the town, embarked. For the three preceding days the town was given up to sack and pillage. The plundering was not confined to the public stores and supplies but was general and indiscriminate. Gen. I. N. Palmer, who will always be remembered by the citizens of eastern Carolina for his kindness and consideration, as well as for his soldierly qualities at that time commanded the district of North Carolina. He was an honorable foe. In the general orders issued after the evacuation, he thus characterizes these outrages:

"It is also well known that the army vandals did not even respect the charitable institutions, but bursting open the doors of the Masonic and Odd Fellows Lodges, pillaged them both, and hawked about the street the regalia and jewels. It is also well known, too, that both public and private stores were entered and plundered, and that devastation and destruction ruled the hour.

"The commanding general had until this time believed it impossible that any troops in his command could have committed so disgraceful an act as this which now blackens the fair fame of the army of North Carolina. He finds, however, that he was sadly mistaken, and that the ranks are disgraced by men who are not soldiers but thieves and scoundrels, dead to all sense of honor and humanity, for whom no punishment can be too severe."

A board of investigation, presided over by Col. James W. Savage, Twelfth New York Cavalry, scathingly denounced the burning and plundering of the town, and said "there could be no palliation of the utterly lawless and wanton character of the plundering."

The fire burned from Pamlico River clear through to the northern limits, and covered eight solid blocks. The bridge was also fired. Nearly one-half of the town was destroyed by this conflagration. No military necessity required the burning of Washington. It was not necessary to cover the evacuation or to aid the escape of the garrison. No hostile force was then investing the town. A few days later, when the Confederates entered, an accidental fire broke out, and fanned by a high wind almost destroyed the other half. After this baptism the town was desolate and ruined. There were scarcely 500 inhabitants remaining of what had been an enterprising and prosperous community of 3,800 three years before.

No town gave more freely of its men and means and no town suffered more for the cause of the Confederacy.

The foregoing only in a small degree attempts to portray the sufferings of Washington and its people, but is given in order to refute the baseless calumny lodged both during and after the war that there was disloyalty on the part of the citizens of Washington to the Confederate government. It is a slander that is unworthy of denial, and though 65 years have elapsed, history is recorded truths, and there is documentary evidence to give the lie to every false charge.

The hoisting of the banner across Main Street welcoming the invading Federals can be dismissed as an act of a very few cowed and whipped citizens who felt that their government (Confederate) had deserted them. The fact that the banner was even raised by local people is not admitted, for immediately afterwards no one would take the responsibility for it.

On March 30, 1862, with the Federals in undisputed control of the town, six well-known and prominent citizens, all old men, were the guests at dinner of Captain Murray, of the U. S. gunboat *Commodore Hull*, lying in the stream off Washington. Every one of them had either sons or near relatives in the Confederate Army. It was a convivial affair. They pulled off a drunk that evidently required some time for recuperation. Captain Murray proposed a toast:

"Here's to the reconstruction of the Federal Union, a plantation in Georgia with 100 niggers, and a summer residence in North Carolina."

The Washingtonians drank to it with great zest, their liquor at that time having taken the proper effect. It is reported that the captain ordered them oared ashore and safely put to bed. This was a shocking and horrible act of disloyalty.

On April 3, Isaiah Respass, the mayor of Washington, was arrested by a raiding party and sent to Richmond by General Holmes, the Confederate commander, then at Greenville. Mr. Respass was an old man, long past the combatant stage. Faced by a court-martial, with seven charges presented against him, hundreds of miles from home, he successfully combated them and was acquitted. Even then he was held and told that he could not return to eastern Carolina. He was accused of furnishing information to the enemy, or at least fraternizing with them. His arrest, contrary to the civil laws of North Carolina, and with a wanton disregard of his rights, caused an outbreak of widespread indignation. On May 1, Judge Badger, of Wake, arose in the convention and presented lengthy resolutions calling upon Governor Clark to make immediate inquiry and with a demand for his release. Messrs. Badger, Warren, and Graham made powerful speeches. After a debate of three days, the proceedings were terminated with a wire from President Davis announcing the release of Mr. Respass. After the war Mr. Respass was a senator from Beaufort county.

During the first week of May, 1862, Edward Stanly left his California home and was received at the White House by Abraham Lincoln. He was depressed and blue, for his home State, which he loved passionately, had been invaded, and both the place of his birth and that of his long residence were in possession of a conquering army. But he had a dream that his very presence there could bring peace out of distraction, and he painted to Mr. Lincoln a glowing picture.

Was not Washington and New Bern, now held by the Union forces, a former Whig stronghold? Had not their public men, even until the very last, suffered vilification on account of their intense love for the Union? Was not this whole war brought on because the people had turned from their old and trusted leaders? What, then, would be easier, now that they were abandoned by the Confederacy, than to go down and wean and coax them back, and take them by the hand as erring brothers? And who, he argued with Lincoln, could better do this than Mr. Stanly himself?

It was no lust for office or for power that inspired Edward Stanly. Love for his old home, and for the Union, pervaded every fiber of his being. He knew also that there was suffering down in North Carolina, and he thought he could alleviate it. He pictured himself as a fearless knight on a mission of chivalry. Mr. Lincoln was impressed. He felt that if he could drive a wedge into North Carolina that the war would quickly end. Just as he did not consult Congress when he made war neither would he consult that body now, and on May 26, 1862, he commissioned Edward Stanly as Provisional Governor of North Carolina, with the rank of brigadier general.

Governor Stanly lost no time. He arrived shortly in New Bern, and spent a month conferring with General Burnside. He unfolded his plan. Idealism was to prevail. The military should play second fiddle, and there should be a minimum of restraint. In all of their

acts they should play the part of the gentleman. They should fraternize freely with the citizens. No one should be called a rebel. The people should be told that they were simply misled, and that the Union was ready to receive them with open arms, and restore their property, including their slaves. This program had not been in effect 3 days before it clashed with the views of the Union general, and in 10 days Stanly was complaining to Lincoln of the excesses of the Federal troops.

He then moved on to Washington, and set up his headquarters in the building occupied by the branch bank of Cape Fear. Mr. Stanly was a persistent, tenacious, and determined man. He forcibly presented his ideas and arguments to all he came in contact with, and there is no denying the fact that he made inroads on the morale of the comparatively few people remaining in Washington. He was received kindly in the town which was formerly the scene of his many triumphs, and his presence no doubt softened the occupation. He wrote letters to many of his old Whig friends in the convention and legislature, including Graham, Badger, and Warren; but they had crossed the Rubicon long before, and sent him word that his mission was futile. Some time later he was issuing a public appeal to all of the State, advocating the election of Vance, and saying it meant a return to the Union. But it seems that he did not know Vance.

While Governor Stanly was busying himself to take North Carolina out of the Confederacy, and was holding a mock election to send his secretary as a Member of the United States Congress, the activities of his brother Alfred Stanly, who lived 3 miles from Washington, were giving both him and the Union garrison much concern. If Edward Stanly loved the Union, Alfred Stanly hated it. If Edward Stanly was the embodiment of national loyalty, Alfred Stanly, as a secessionist, surpassed it. He adored the Confederacy and hated "damn Yankees." He had tried to enlist, but was rejected on account of his age. So he became a bushwhacker de luxe, and his favorite occupation was to snipe at anyone wearing a blue uniform, as raiding parties would pass his house. It is known that he wounded several. It is said that he killed some. He thrilled when he was denouncing his brother's rule. One day a squad went out and burned his plantation, but the old man always remained an irreconcilable.

Governor Stanly carried on a lengthy correspondence with Lincoln. He constantly protested the thwarting and overruling of his policies by the Army, and was always mentioning the excesses of the troops, and complaining of their entire lack of cooperation with him. Soon Stevens and Sumner, on the floor of Congress, were interrogating the President, as to "this man Stanly who is assuming to usurp the powers of the military."

The provisional governor had accomplished nothing. Each day his disillusionment grew, and he was sad. On March 2, 1863, he resigned, no doubt upon the suggestion of Lincoln. He returned to California, entering into a large law practice, and was eminently successful. He died in 1872, at the age of 62, and was buried there. Edward Stanly was a great lawyer, and a wise statesman. He never lost his love and deep affection for the people of his native State. At least one of the votes for the acquittal of Andrew Johnson is accredited to his influence.

The banner incident, the social party of several old men on a Union gunboat, the arrest of Mayor Respass, and the visit of Stanly were all magnified, and mutterings were abroad that Washington was disloyal to the Confederacy. The truth is that the town and county were bled white, both of men and property, and the people displayed the stoicism of Spartans, and bore their sufferings heroically.

#### CHAPTER III

The war was now over, and William W. Holden was the provisional governor. North Carolina was to drink the bitter dregs for years to come. Governor Holden immediately set about to restore the State government, making a conscientious effort for the immediate return of the State to the Union, and appointing men of high character to fill all of the offices until the legislature could meet in the fall. The dream of his life was to be elected governor by the people. As judge of the second judicial district, he named Edward J. Warren, and appointed Daniel G. Fowle, also a native of Washington, and later to become governor, as the judge from the Wake district.

While no interest was taken, there was no objection to the call for a convention in 1865. Its personnel was selected solely by white votes, and many able figures were members. It was composed largely of men who were former Whigs, and it was imbued with a spirit of cooperation, and a desire to set the house in order again. Judge Edwin G. Reade, a former senator in the Confederate Congress, was its president. Judge Warren and Mr. Donnell, as members from Beaufort, rendered able service on account of their wide experience, Mr. Warren being appointed on the committee to redraft the constitution.

The legislature met the latter part of November, Governor Holden having submitted his cause to the voters, and being defeated by Jonathan Worth. On November 29, Gen. U. S. Grant visited the senate chamber of North Carolina, and was introduced to the body by Judge Warren. General Grant was there under instructions from Andrew Johnson, with whose policy at that time he was in hearty

accord. The commander of the United States Army was most gracious, and in conversation did not hesitate to express his views and his opinion that as soon as an election could be held that North Carolina would be represented in the National Congress.

S. F. Phillips, Richard S. Donnell, Judge Warren, and Colonel Yellowley had a private talk with the general lasting over an hour, which, Mr. Donnell stated, "ought to be productive of excellent results, as we were impressed with the broad views of General Grant and believe that in his attitude toward General Lee at the surrender he has already shown us that he will be a friend of the South."

Little did they dream at that time that lust for office would cause General Grant to adopt a policy a few years later that placed North Carolina and other Southern States under an iron heel that no conqueror had ever before been guilty of.

The legislature immediately went about to set up a stable government under the Constitution. On December 1 Judge Warren, by joint ballot of the legislature, was elected judge of the second district, receiving 89 votes to 68 for George Howard. The district at that time was composed of the counties of Beaufort, Pitt, Edgecombe, Martin, Washington, and Tyrrell. He resigned as a member of the senate on December 18, and Col. David M. Carter was elected to succeed him. No member was more active or more prominent stand in the senate than Colonel Carter during this unexpired term. At the same time Mr. Warren was elected judge, Judge Fowle, of Wake, also received his election.

Just before Holden went out of office he appointed B. F. Moore, Richard S. Donnell, and William S. Mason as commissioners to prepare and report to the legislature a system of laws upon the subject of freedmen. This report was adopted by the legislature, the other two members saying that Donnell was entitled to the major credit for the work.

The work of the convention of 1865-66 was finally approved by a vote of 63 to 30, Messrs. Warren, George Howard, and Thomas J. Jarvis being numbered among those opposing it. When it was submitted to the people Judge Warren gave a dignified statement containing his reasons for opposition. It was rejected both in Beaufort County and the State, and with exception of the ordinances it had adopted, the work of the convention was in vain.

Worth was now governor and with the beginning of 1866 Judge Warren entered upon his judicial career with a sense of relief from party politics and the storms of the day. During the latter part of the War the courts had ceased to function and he found that practically his whole time was occupied. During his few vacant weeks he would return to Raleigh and participate as a member of the convention. As judge, he covered every section of the State, evincing a keen and active interest in his work. He had cared nothing for politics and the bench was the only honor that had really appealed to him. The late Judge Henry G. Connor stated that he well remembered the first court held in Wilson and how he was struck with his manner and deep logic and innate sense of justice. In Orange County he clashed with the Ku-Klux, who were interested in seeing a negro executed, only to discover that they were accusing the wrong man. But it was in the equity and law courts where he excelled, and there is frequent commendation of his decisions in the opinions of the supreme court. "He was the model nisi prius judge of his day," said Judge William A. Moore, a political opponent. He served on the bench until July 1, 1868, being defeated by Edmund W. Jones in an election where almost the entire vote against him came from negroes.

On June 3, 1867, Richard S. Donnell died from an incurable malady. He was only 47 years of age, but in that brief span there was crowded a life of service for North Carolina. His body was carried to his native New Bern and laid beside his father, Judge John R. Donnell, who added luster to the superior court bench of the State for 18 years.

Political readjustments were now beginning to take place, and men were casting about for the future. Until now Mr. Rodman was quiet, as were all of the old secessionists. General Grimes, with the glamor of a great military record, was in seclusion in Raleigh, and Matt W. Ransom had retired to his large estates on the banks of the Roanoke in Northampton. In spite of the efforts of Holden and Worth, the State was not yet in the Union, though over two years had elapsed. Mr. Rodman began conversations with both his friends and those of former hostile political beliefs. One of his first meetings was with Judge Warren, Colonel Carter, Major Sparrow, and Mr. Satterthwaite, the latter having moved into Beaufort. When the first call for a convention had been voted down in the county in 1861, and Mr. Warren and Mr. Rodman had debated the question out in every section, a feeling of antagonism had sprung up between them, but now that the struggle was over they had a mutual respect for each other that lasted for life. All of these men sat around the table to discuss the tragic plight of the State.

Congress had submitted the fourteenth amendment, and Mr. Rodman saw only gloom ahead. He vividly pictured the horrors of negro domination in the South, and lamented the fact that already mercenaries, camp followers, and unprincipled carpetbaggers were infesting the



State. "Are we to let North Carolina become a prey to these people, and lead the ignorant blacks," he asked, "or shall men like us, who hold the State near and dear, step in and lead and assume control."

It was not a matter to be lightly brushed aside. Although the State government under Worth was functioning splendidly, a military despotism under the acts of Congress had been set up and the civil authorities were being constantly overruled and humiliated. Mr. Rodman felt that the only way either the State or the South could be helped was a submission to the new order and an assertion of leadership by representative men. It might be easy to criticize and speculate after the lapsing of nearly three-quarters of a century, but these were critical times and a man's motives should be judged by his accomplishments under the conditions that confronted him.

Colonel Carter, who carried to his death terrible wounds he had received on the field of battle, became after Gettysburg and Vicksburg an ardent advocate of peace at almost any price. In January, 1865, he was a member of a secret legislative committee that urged upon President Davis to make terms. He listened to Mr. Rodman with great sympathy, and it is certain that he left Mr. Rodman under the impression that he subscribed to his views. Later in the year, when the Republican Party was organized in the State, although Colonel Carter did not attend he was named as a member of its executive committee. In about a month he disavowed it and announced that he was a conservative. In a later campaign this incident was hurt Colonel Carter politically. Major Sparrow and Mr. Satterthwaite could see no advantage in such an alliance as proposed by Mr. Rodman.

Judge Warren, by reason of his New England birth and his former pronounced Whig views, was expected to listen. He had cordially hated the ante bellum democracy, and a promise of leadership was held out to him in the new order by Judges Reade and Settle. Even after he had been defeated for judge, it was represented to him that Judge Starbuck would accept a Federal position, and if he would move to Salem he would be named his successor, and would be given the first vacancy on the supreme court. But Judge Warren, now a man without a party, would not listen. So, from the beginning of the war, he called himself a Conservative, for the word "Democrat" was still an anathema to him. And Colonel Carter, Major Sparrow, and Mr. Satterthwaite also adopted that title, for just now they could not stomach to affiliate with a party they had always detested.

So Mr. Rodman attended the first Republican convention in Raleigh and cast his lot with that party. From the outset he was the leader of the conservative, or white wing, in striking contrast with Judge Reade, who went with the radical element. Never did Mr. Rodman countenance negro domination or negro office holding, and to his influence, more than anyone else, is attributed the fact that Beaufort in years to come never suffered negro control, as so many of her neighbors did. With the exception of a few aldermen in Washington and a few school committeemen in the county that horror was spared. From that moment William B. Rodman exerted a far-reaching influence on the constitutional and judicial history of North Carolina.

But Congress had decreed that the "conquered Province" must have a new constitution, and General Canby, the military commander, initiated the enrollment of the negroes for their first suffrage. Another great convention was held in Raleigh, this time composed of the Conservatives and Democrats. They denounced the determination for a Constitutional Convention and banded themselves to oppose it. Judge Warren wrote Governor Vance, and Judge Fowle, who had resigned, that his attendance would be incompatible with judicial propriety, but that he was in complete sympathy with their movement.

The election was held, and as expected, the call for the convention carried. William B. Rodman and William Stilley were elected as members from Beaufort. Such a conglomeration of constitution makers had never before been gathered. Carpetbaggers, negroes, illiterate whites with deep-seated prejudices, and about 15 high-class men made up the assemblage. In the latter class, besides Mr. Rodman, were Plato Durham, of Cleveland, John W. Graham, and E. M. Holt, of Orange, the last three having no influence, but making memorable fights on all controverted questions. There was a dearth of lawyers in the body. It is paying no compliment to William Blount Rodman to say that he towered above everyone there. He would have been a distinguished leader in any convention or legislative body, where his legal ability and forensic powers would have been in demand. When the convention organized he must have shuddered at the colossal task confronting him, for he had fully determined to battle every question and save the State, if possible, from those who were ready to despoil her. As a former Confederate soldier, with his disabilities still unremoved, and as a former well-known Democrat, he was looked upon with suspicion by the negroes and carpetbag element. That section of the convention immediately set up as their leader the notorious but able Albion W. Tourgee.

Mr. Rodman was immediately appointed as one of the committee of 17 to report on the best mode of proceeding to frame the constitution and civil government. He was then made chairman of the committee on the judicial department, and it was here he best served North Carolina. From the first meeting of this committee he was in constant clash with Tourgee, and they waged a memorable battle both in committee and on the floor of the convention over the judicial article. Mr.

Rodman was strongly opposed to the election of judges, and desired to retain the old distinction between actions at law and suits in equity. Tourgee took the opposite view on both questions, and by close votes his opinions prevailed. Mr. Rodman then gracefully yielded, and thereafter wrote all of article 4 of the constitution.

Surveying his handiwork he predicted "it will stand the test of experience and be more valued with every year of its existence." Mr. Rodman was also the author of sections 22, 27, 35, 37, and a part of 32 of the bill of rights. He wrote section 3, of article 5, on revenue and taxation, which in recent years has been amended. Mr. Rodman made a long fight in the convention to strike out section 21 of the bill of rights, which provided that the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended. He desired the writ suspended during war, insurrection, or invasion, but his proposition was overwhelmingly defeated. The late Judge George H. Brown considered that Mr. Rodman's most valuable contribution to the constitution was the fight he waged to preserve the equation between the property and poll tax, as the State was then financially prostrated.

When article 11 was under discussion, dealing with punishments, penal institutions, etc., Mr. Rodman riddled the committee's proposals with amendments, all of which were adopted. But outside of his work in writing the judicial sections, his most conspicuous effort was on the suffrage article, where he successfully combated the wild and incendiary views of men like Abbott, Tourgee, and Edmund W. Jones, who believed in social equality. Looking backward, it is a wonder that the convention did not proscribe every prominent man in the State, so great was the animosity then prevailing. Mr. Rodman, though having the confidence of the presiding officer from the first day of the session, and being thus favored by committee appointments, had to fight his way to leadership, and long before adjournment he was the recognized spokesman of the body.

The convention unanimously made Mr. Rodman one of the three commissioners to prepare a code of laws, and his work became a model for future codes. He was also appointed as one of two members of the convention to prepare an address to the people urging them to adopt the constitution.

The constitution was adopted by a large majority, Beaufort joining the other counties in favoring it. It is rather singular to note that Mr. Rodman, who wrote more sections of the constitution than any other man in the convention was not permitted to vote to ratify it, though in the same election he was elected to membership on the supreme court. Judge Warren, Major Sparrow, Colonel Carter, and Mr. Satterthwaite all issued fervent appeals to the people to reject it, but neither could they vote on the question. The disabilities of all of them were removed shortly after the election. It is also worth noting that the proposition to increase the membership of the supreme court from three to five was only carried in the convention by a majority of one. Had this not prevailed, it is hard to speculate what three would have composed the court.

The constitution of 1868, the organic law of the State to-day, conceived and born in prejudice and strife, and prepared by a convention, the overwhelmingly majority of which was hostile to North Carolina, has, notwithstanding its conception, stood the test. Recent conventions in many Northern States had afforded a chart. The fact that it was written by a mere handful of its membership is probably responsible for its lack of commissions and omissions. An abler body might have been hopelessly divided on fundamentals. In reviewing its birth it is to be wondered that such a document emerged. That it has passed through the decades with slight mutilation is surprising, and it is doubtful that the tinkering with it by amendment has very greatly improved it.

Defeated for reelection Judge Warren again actively entered the practice of law and formed a partnership with Col. David M. Carter. Several years later William B. Rodman Myers, the son-in-law of Judge Warren, was admitted to the firm. They had all the practice they could attend to and appeared in most of the far eastern courts.

The election, along with the adoption of the constitution, was a clean sweep for the Republican candidates and every branch of the State government came under their control. Holden became governor in his own right, while a supreme court was chosen composed of Pearson as chief justice and Reade, Rodman, Dick, and Settle as associate justices. In spite of the urge to engage in partisan politics, to which they freely yielded, no greater body has ever sat as the State's highest tribunal than this supreme court of the reconstruction era. All of them were native North Carolinians of distinguished ancestry, and men of character and the highest order of ability. It was the brightest spot in that sordid period and the surest hope of justice from an inferior, partisan, and at times corrupt superior-court judiciary. The opinion of Chief Justice Pearson in the habeas corpus cases was cited by the Democrats as an example of utter collapse of constitutional government, and coming as it did it staggered the sober thought of the State. Reviewing it to-day, however, aside from the shaken faith in our institutions, we must admit that had the writs been attempted to be enforced a stream of blood would have flowed in North Carolina from Alamance and Caswell to the Atlantic Ocean.

Judge Rodman, a member of this great court for 10 years, contributed in marked degree to its record. By virtue of having been a

member of the convention that framed the constitution, he at once became its chief interpreter and expounder. It is interesting to observe the points of difference between the members of the court on constitutional questions and to contrast the views of Rodman, as a framer, with the other members. From the beginning there were divergent views on the part of Rodman on the one hand and his associates on the other as to the proper interpretation and construction of the article on homesteads, and they remained so until subsequent legislatures clarified enabling acts.

Before the question ever reached the court Judge Rodman in an able treatise had discussed the duty of the court should the legislature disregard the equation between property and polls and in subsequent opinions down to a late date this dictum has been referred to. In 1870, when the Republican legislature desired to extend their term beyond the biennium, by reason of a strained construction of the constitution, they passed a resolution asking for an opinion from the supreme court. Chief Justice Pearson and Justice Dick responded as "a duty of courtesy and respect," while Justices Rodman, Reade, and Settle declined. Judge Rodman went further than an outright declination and stated that if they wished merely his individual opinion, he would feel at liberty to give it, and then rather ingeniously pointed out the controverted sections, and ended by saying that if there was any doubt in the minds of the legislature that "a wise and becoming policy would require you to give the people the benefit of the doubt." The attempt by the carpet-bag legislature to perpetuate itself in office proved abortive. It should be mentioned that the supreme court in recent years has rendered opinions upon the request of the general assembly.

None of the writs of habeas corpus in the Holden-Kirk affair were issued by Judge Rodman. This was probably due to the fact that the Supreme Court was in recess, and that he lived in a section of the State far removed from the scene of trouble. There is no doubt, though, that all of the members of the court concurred in the opinion of Judge Pearson on that subject.

No attempt is made here to analyze or set out some of the outstanding opinions of Judge Rodman while a member of the court, which covered almost every subject of constitutional and statute law. They are his memorial and are cited to-day for their lucidity and logic.

#### CHAPTER IV

It was the November term, 1868, of the superior court of Beaufort County, the first court to be held under the new constitution. John H. Small, a large farmer and business man, had been sworn in as foreman of the grand jury. Several members of this grand inquest were negroes.

"Mr. Foreman and gentlemen," piped the judge, "the people have declared that there shall be a new order in North Carolina, and that men who despise disloyalty shall be in control. Thank God we are back in the glorious Union again. The man who crushed the rebellion has just been put in office, and he with our help is going to run this country. I am glad to see on this grand jury to-day some of our newly liberated colored brothers, and I first charge you to see that their political and property rights are protected."

There then followed a harangue of an hour, interspersed with frequent profanity and occasional garbled quotations from the Bible. Mr. Small, one of that New England migration to eastern Carolina in the early forties, blushed for shame.

The occupant of the bench did not participate in the war. He was the delegate from both Washington and Tyrrell in the convention of 1868. While possessed of a law license, he had rarely appeared in a courthouse. He was tall, slim, and rawboned, with inanimate features and a glassy stare in his eyes. He wore a long frock coat, an extra tall silk hat, and presented an immaculate appearance. He walked almost on his toes, which caused his body to sway from side to side. He strutted like a peacock. He was a confirmed drunkard, a bitter partisan, thoroughly unscrupulous, without character or morals, and corrupt and debase. While lacking any knowledge of law, he later became as fiendish as a Jeffreys.

"Your honor," said Mr. Sparrow, "the wife of the defendant, Isaac Barrow, died last night. I ask that the case be continued to the spring term, the solicitor being quite willing."

"The motion is denied," snapped the court.

He got supreme satisfaction by being addressed as "his honor" by men like Sparrow, Warren, Satterthwaite, and Carter.

The judge was Edmund W. Jones, of the county of Washington, but already known far and wide as "Jay Bird" Jones (a name given him by Josiah Turner), and by the grace of a large negro majority presiding over the superior courts of North Carolina. At the solicitor's table sat Joseph J. Martin, of Martin. He was an honorable gentleman and held in high esteem.

After a few preliminaries, a recess was taken, and Judge Jones promptly headed for a popular bar.

That afternoon Capt. J. J. Laughinghouse, who lived just over the line in Pitt County, entered a plea of guilty to an assault on the sheriff. The judge imposed a fine of \$50, and then malignantly asked the captain what he had to say. Captain Laughinghouse, with the fire and vigor that was his for life, expressed his contempt for the court in language and oaths that made the air blue. The darkness of a winter evening was beginning to fall, and this was the last matter

to be disposed of. In addition to the fine Judge Jones sentenced him to jail for 30 days, immediately adjourned court, and was spirited to a house on the outskirts of town.

Captain Laughinghouse had to serve all of his sentence. The ladies of Washington decorated his cell so as to hide the bars, a feather bed was moved in, the choicest food was brought in daily from their tables, and the captain in later years admitted that so great was his satisfaction in paying his respects to the judge, and so pleasant had his imprisonment been made, that he hated to see his term expire.

On Wednesday morning of the same term of court there was called the case of State v. Jim Carter. The courthouse was packed to overflowing. Jim was a former slave of Col. David M. Carter and had accompanied him to war. When Colonel Carter had been left for dead on the battle field it was Jim who had found him and carried him on his back to a place of safety and nursed him back to life. In the recent election Jim had voted the Conservative or Democratic ticket, and had ostracized himself with the colored population. He was finally attacked on Main Street by several of them with the result that Jim wielded his knife with great dexterity and stabbed one to death. So he was to be tried for murder, and his former master, a ferocious old lion, sat by his side. For weeks before the trial the whole county had become either pro or anti Jim Carter, and the case had assumed a political aspect in that the Democrats were for acquittal and the Republicans for conviction. Over 200 Democrats sat in that courthouse with pistols in their pockets.

On a question of admissibility of some phase of the evidence Colonel Carter received a severe reprimand from the court for insisting upon the constitutional rights of his client and was ordered to apologize.

He thereupon straightened up and informed his honor that while it was true he was conducting a hearing where the State was seeking to take a man's life, that in no sense of the word could this be termed either a trial or a court; that by his actions the occupant of the chair had already shown he was lacking in any knowledge of the law and was devoid of any semblance of character or morals; that it was painful for him as a lawyer to address such a tribunal; that his conduct was only typical of what could be expected hereafter on the superior court bench; that the evidence sought to be offered by the defendant was competent and would be admitted regardless of the opinion of the court, and that so far as any apology was concerned he would sink lower than the mud-sills of hell before he retracted anything. Standing 6 feet from the judge he folded his arms and glared.

It was a full five minutes of painful silence before a word was spoken, and Colonel Carter was then told to proceed with the examination of the witness. The evidence attempted to be barred was presented in full to the mixed jury of whites and blacks.

The news had reached the judge, who was visibly under the influence of whisky, that he would be held to strict account for the jury's verdict and that pistols would bark out at him in the event of conviction. The opening of court that morning had been delayed an hour, due to the absence of his honor, who had finally been found at the home of a negro prostitute, where he had spent the night. Blear-eyed, trembling, his bloodless face without expression, he realized that his judicial orders issued at times with merciless severity were without avail, even though surrounded by court officers of his own political party. During the three minutes the jury was out it was a tense scene in the courtroom. The judge squirmed and twisted in his chair and every eye was on him. The silence was broken when a tiny crack of the jury room door was opened and a little bullet-headed negro squeaked out, "Not guilty." The crowd was content in not hearing an acquittal in the impressive court form and bedlam reigned as they rushed in the street. That night Washington staged a celebration.

The gentle and erudite Dr. David T. Tayloe, a gentleman, scholar, and learned physician, who had served four years in the Confederate Army, looked in on the proceedings and became a militant. Doctor Tayloe was a former Whig leader, and a campaign song composed by him had been adopted by the Zachary Taylor campaign and was used throughout the Nation. He was asking himself what it availed a man in former days to have been a friend of the Union.

Dr. Charles J. O'Hagan came down from Pitt to observe the workings of the Jones court, and was a calm but embittered spectator. He had recently made the sacrifice as the nominee for Congress and had been defeated. North Carolina will never see his like again. Born in Ireland, he had a passion for freedom and individual liberty. He had a national reputation as a physician, and after a distinguished service in the Army, did as much as any man to redeem his State. Although a small boy when he died, well does the writer remember him. He was both his father's and grandfather's lifelong and devoted friend. Truly, he was one of the State's great men.

At the fall term, 1870, Judge Jones presiding, H. E. Stilley, a member of the legislature, and colonel of Holden's Beaufort County Militia, made an unwarranted attack in a statement to the judge on Dr. John McDonald, who was sitting in the courthouse. Judge Jones, without investigation, castigated the doctor in stinging language. The fiery and temperamental physician jumped up in court, knocked Colonel Stilley down and threw him out of the courthouse. He was adjudged in contempt, fined \$100, and placed under a peace bond. When court



adjourned, Doctor McDonald accosted the judge, grabbed him by the collar, and shook his hat off his head.

Carpenter and scallawag justice was being meted out with a vengeance in the superior courts of the State.

Judge Jones was continually reversed by the supreme court, this happening eleven out of twelve times in one report. The bar of Washington carried up on appeal every case he tried, Colonel Carter doing so with great glee.

After Holden was impeached, the house passed articles of impeachment of Judge Jones, but he was permitted to resign without trial. He returned to Plymouth and became more dissolute than ever, his friends and companions being chiefly negroes. One day he was at a fishery on the shores of Albemarle Sound, where large catches of herrings were being thrown in boxes on the sand. He reeled over with a stroke, falling among the dying fish. They carried him home and he passed away that night. It is said that not a single white person attended his funeral.

In the old man's latter days, he strangely took up the idea that he wished to learn to sing. These were the days of old-fashioned singing schools. There is hardly anyone left now who remembers the geography singing classes that made for such wonderful efficiency in the memory of geographical points and facts, but many now living remember the Carmina Sacra Classes that gave such delightful entertainment and made congregational singing very tolerable in the absence of a church organ. There was one of such classes going on in Plymouth, having the usual number of members and giving great entertainment.

"Jay Bird" joined and persisted in going vigorously into his work, entering early and staying late, and singing loud and strong. His notes and tones, according to report, were equal to old man Linkhaw's, of Roberson County, reported in the Sixty-ninth North Carolina Report, page 214. The difference was that Jay Bird's produced merriment and fun while Linkhaw's actually prevented religious worship. The judge had one of those voices that are not usual. A bass note like that of a bull frog was followed immediately by one sounding like a carpenter filing his saw. One day when he had broken up the class with laughter, he saw the awkwardness of his situation, and when the laughter ceased he delivered himself of this proposition:

"A slavish adherence to the notes destroys the symmetry of music."

It is not reported that the old gentleman's voice acquired much skill for melody, nor what effect his efforts in that direction had on his private entertainment, but it would probably be admitted that his musical philosophy was sound, and expressed more wit than his mind was usually capable of.

On April 19, 1869, an article appeared in the columns of the Raleigh Sentinel headed: "A Solemn Protest of the Bar of North Carolina Against Judicial Interference in Political Affairs." This unusual document was caused by the late public demonstrations of political partisanship by the judges of the supreme court, and was aimed especially at Judge Reade, who had admitted the authorship of a shocking document signed by the Republican members of the "carpetbag" legislature in an address to the people of the State.

After reciting the exhibitions of mad partisanship by the judiciary, the article closed with this:

"Unwilling that our silence should be construed into an indifference to the humiliating spectacle now passing around us; influenced solely by a love and veneration for the past purity, which has distinguished the administration of the law in our State, and animated by the hope that the voice of the bar of North Carolina will not be powerless to avert the pernicious example, which we have denounced, and to repress its contagious influence, we have under a sense of solemn duty subscribed and published this paper."

It was signed by 110 members of the bar of the State, and was prepared by B. F. Moore, E. G. Haywood, and Asa Biggs. Judge Warren was in Raleigh at the time of its preparation and was the third one to sign it. Major Sparrow and Mr. Satterthwaite also signed.

When the supreme court met in June, it first ascertained how many of the signers practiced in that court, which proved to be 25. An order was then issued that these 25, one of whom was Judge Warren, should be "disabled from hereafter appearing as attorneys and counsellors in the court, unless they shall severally appear on Tuesday, June 15, 1869, and show cause to the contrary." The rule was discharged as to the others. The court held that the rule could be discharged as to the 25 on their making "a disavowal upon oath of any intention in signing and publishing said paper to commit a contempt of the supreme court or to impair the respect due its authority."

From time to time different ones would file answers to purge themselves of contempt, but no answer was ever filed by Judge Warren, Vance, Jarvis, and a few others. The matter was allowed to drop.

In the early part of 1870 President Grant appointed Col. S. T. Carrow, the sheriff of Beaufort County, as United States marshal of North Carolina. He was 6 feet tall, with a massive frame. He had no educational advantages, but was endowed with a strong personality and was powerful in political debate. He had joined the Republican Party and became sheriff. As such it was his duty to collect the odious special taxes assessed by the "carpetbag" legislature, and his great heart and charitable instincts caused him to pay out of his own pocket taxes

for literally hundreds of people. He exerted great political influence and had a most salutary effect on the negroes, who were afraid of him. The office of United States marshal was one of the richest political plums in the State, and the fees were large. Colonel Carrow surrounded himself with fine horses and carriages, dressed fashionably, entertained lavishly, and was again profuse with his charity, his political friends and foes being recipients.

After the humiliating opinion of Chief Justice Pearson declaring the power of the judiciary exhausted, it was he who served the writs of habeas corpus issued by Judge Brooks in the United States court and took in charge the prisoners of the Holden-Kirk war, which later resulted in the impeachment of the governor. They rejoiced in being in Colonel Carrow's custody, and many of them wrote him letters speaking highly of the consideration and courtesy shown them.

The spring of 1870 had rolled around, and the State was so shocked at the program of pillage and plunder inaugurated by the carpetbag legislature that it was literally on fire. On June 4 there assembled in the Beaufort County courthouse one of the largest and greatest political conventions held in the East. It was composed of old-line Whigs, Democrats, and many Republicans who were already leaving that party. It was called the "Conservative Democratic convention," and a full county ticket was quickly unanimously nominated. It proposed for the senate Judge Edward J. Warren and for the house Maj. Thomas Sparrow. Enthusiasm was rampant, for regardless of past differences, the delegates were now united for a single purpose.

The Eastern Intelligencer, published in Washington and edited by Dr. James F. Long, a quite able paper carrying as its slogan, "Death to radicalism," tells about it in its issue of June 8:

"When the name of Judge Warren was announced there were loud cries for him, for the people wanted to hear from him, as it was uncertain whether he would accept the nomination. It was feared his known physical infirmities would force him to decline. He soon made his appearance, and though hobbling and moving with great difficulty, he in about an hour's speech convinced the crowded court room that though rheumatism might to some extent have impaired his physical energies the profound logical mind, the brilliant, clear, perceptive, progressive intellect of Warren was still there stronger than ever, brighter than ever, as full of fire as in the days of yore, and the tongue lacked none of its native eloquence. We will not attempt an analysis of his address. Sufficient that he gave radicalism and its failures an exposé, every word of which was a nail in the right place, driven and clinched by the master of builders."

Of Major Sparrow it said:

"Sparrow, the servant of the county, the popular man of the county, whom the people love (and he merits it, because all of his life he has been making personal sacrifices—pecuniary and professional—to serve them), was next called. In his own unborrowed style he entertained them with choice morceaux of political viands that made their mouth water with anticipation of what the full feast of radical exposures would be when, uncoated and with sleeves rolled up, he will open the campaign."

Satterthwaite, it said, excelled his past efforts as an orator, and Colonel Carter, after presenting the resolutions of the convention, confined his remarks to giving "some wise advice to the colored people conducive to their future happiness and prosperity."

The campaign was fiercely conducted, but the ticket was elected by a large majority, and Beaufort County again sent two of her sons to Raleigh to figure prominently once more in history about to be made.

#### CHAPTER V

The legislature of redemption met in November, 1870. For another time the chairmanships of the judiciary committee in both senate and house went to Beaufort County. The Conservatives or Democrats had a wide majority in each body, and they immediately set about to undo what the despoilers had been doing for the last two years. They elected Thomas J. Jarvis, then of Tyrrell, and later to become governor, as speaker of the house.

On December 15, 1870, Maj. Thomas Sparrow, of Beaufort, appeared at the bar of the Senate and impeached Gov. W. W. Holden, in the name of all of the people of the State. By reason of his commanding influence, his purity of character, and outstanding legal ability, he had been chosen as chairman of the board of managers. Lieutenant Governor Caldwell retired to assume charge of the executive department, and Judge Warren was immediately elected as President pro tempore of the Senate.

The trial proper of Governor Holden, with Chief Justice Pearson presiding, began on January 23, 1871. He was arraigned on eight articles for high crimes and misdemeanors, based on a gross usurpation of the duties of his office, the countenancing and encouraging of the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, and a general overriding of the constitutional rights of the citizens of the State. It was quite natural that the managers should select as their chief counsel that sturdy patriot, William A. Graham. The vicissitudes of politics had made this former United States Whig Senator and governor and outstanding advocate of the Union, the chart for patriots to follow. Governor Holden was represented by counsel of the highest ability, picked from both parties.

On February 2 Major Sparrow made the opening argument to the senate, sitting as a court of impeachment. He succinctly pointed out the path to be followed, and his speech without a taint of demagoguery, and abounding in logic and legal argument, set a high-water mark for one of the greatest of State trials. And how different it was from another august body that had met a few years before to degrade a President who refused to bend to unscrupulous partisans. In that, they would have ousted a President who obeyed the Constitution, while in this, they were bringing to justice a governor who had openly flaunted it.

Major Sparrow began:

"The spectacle exhibited in this senate chamber to-day is without precedent in the annals of our country. It is the arraignment of the chief executive officer of a State, by the people of a State, through the representatives of the people, at the bar of the senate, for crimes and misdemeanors in office. It is an accusation preferred by the people of North Carolina against the Governor of North Carolina for an alleged invasion of their rights as secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the land, and the subversion of their liberties. It is a charge preferred by the people that he, who was exalted by their suffrages to the highest office within their gift, to be a terror to evildoers, has himself become a doer of evil—that he who was sworn to support and maintain the law has become himself a violator of the law—that he whose sworn duty it was to protect the innocent and punish the guilty has made instruments of the wicked and disorderly to punish the innocent and unoffending, verifying in his person the scripture maxim, 'When the wicked are in authority the people mourn.'

"Those who may imagine that this impeachment of the governor is an attempt of a successful political party, in the flush of their triumph, to depose from his high office one who had made himself politically obnoxious to them, greatly underestimate the case and impute unworthy motives where none exist. As a party measure it would be fruitless of results, as the removal from office of the present incumbent would place in the executive chair as his successor one of his party, the lieutenant governor, who is far less obnoxious to the people. It is a movement, Mr. Chief Justice and senators, which rises above all party considerations. It is the uprising of an outraged and oppressed people to vindicate the violated law. Of far less moment is the suggestion sometimes seen and heard that this prosecution ought not to be carried on in the present depleted condition of the public treasury and amid the financial prostration which abounds in all our borders. That it will cost money and further burden the people!

"The questions of dollars and cents, poor as are the people of North Carolina, oppressed as they have been, plundered as they have been, groaning as they are under a burden of taxation, is a suggestion underestimating, as it is unworthy of their honor, their intelligence, their virtue, and their patriotism. The price to be paid for liberty is always costly, sometimes in blood, invariably in treasure. No true son of North Carolina will hesitate to pay this price. God grant that it may never again be in blood! God grant that in all time to come brother may never in all this land be arrayed against brother in civil strife.

"Mr. Chief Justice and senators, the people of North Carolina have always been distinguished for their obedience to law and their love of liberty. If they possess any peculiar traits preeminent above all others, they are these. It has been so in all their history from the 20th of May, 1775, of Mecklenburg memory, to the present time. The cause which they seek to vindicate before this tribunal is not theirs only but the cause of all people who seek to preserve the forms of constitutional government and civil liberty. It is the cause of all free people and of all people struggling to be free the world over; the cause of New York and Missouri as well as North Carolina. The question is a great question. The issues are momentous issues. Are the principles of liberty, built up and established and perpetuated in Great Britain, handed down to our fathers, adopted by them and cemented with their blood—are these great principles of the English Bill of Rights of 1689, incorporated by the framers of our organic law into that instrument, of the great charter and habeas corpus, to be preserved in this country? No less issues than these are involved in this proceeding. Do we live in the enjoyment of constitutional freedom? Have we preserved unimpaired the liberties bequeathed to us by our English and American ancestors or have we adopted a higher law than these, the law of tyrants and of temporary majorities, which override and subvert at will the forms of constitutional freedom?

"Mr. Chief Justice, when those in whose persons the rights of freedom and the law of liberty have been violated by their unlawful arrest and imprisonment shall have appealed to the judiciary for relief in vain; when the people through their representatives shall have called upon the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment, for redress in vain, then, indeed, will our liberties have departed. Then will a revolution in our form of government have taken place, fearful in its proportions and realized by none of us. Then will the glorious temple of liberty reared for us by our fathers, instead of being, as we had too fondly supposed, real, substantial, built of strong rock, and founded on a rock, have become as the house of the foolish man, built upon sand—swept away

like similar fabrics of old by the strong hand of power and the 'necessity' pleas of tyrants."

Every step in the trial was contested, and both the managers and respondent introduced voluminous testimony. The chief justice presided with great ability, but there are several roll-call votes where, on motion of Judge Warren, he was overruled and evidence held competent by the senators was admitted.

On March 22, 1871, Governor Holden was convicted on six of the eight articles of impeachment, Judge Warren voting "guilty" on all of them, the judgment ousting him from office and debarring him from holding office in the future. Judge Warren filed a well-considered written opinion setting forth the reasons for his votes, which was concurred in by Senator L. C. Edwards, of Granville. He scathingly denounced the unlawful arrests of Josiah Turner, Judge Kerr, and others, and stated that "from the beginning to the close of the dismal drama he [Holden] was fatally bent on mischief." He availed himself of the opportunity to express his "abhorrence of the secret political societies which existed in Alamance," and closed with this:

"If in all this lawlessness, whether in Alamance or Caswell, I could find a justification or excuse for the lawless acts of the respondent, I would most cheerfully say so. One crime can not be set off against another. However, much turbulent and misguided men may have taken the law into their own hands, he was not at liberty to do so. They were citizens, and were entitled to the benefit of those provisions of the constitution which protect even the guilty from arrest, imprisonment, trial, and punishment, otherwise than by the law of the land."

In 1865 Judge Warren had voted for Holden for governor in his race with Worth, believing that in the few months that he had been provisional governor, he had made a splendid record, and was imbued with lofty sentiments in restoring government in the State. But when Worth was elected he gave his administration strong support, and immediately broke with Holden forever, when he endeavored to get the United States to intervene and nullify the Worth election. He always believed that Governor Holden was a man of the highest and purest personal character, and that while later surrounded by thieves and cutthroats, the personal integrity of the governor remained unstained. Every instinct of Judge Warren revolted against constitutional violations, and he voted to impeach Holden because he had flagrantly disregarded the organic law of the State.

Just a few weeks before the impeachment the Conservatives went into caucus to select a nominee for United States Senator. Vance was the leading candidate, but there was considerable opposition to him, and he was not nominated until the twenty-seventh ballot. For 18 ballots a movement headed by Col. W. A. Allen, of Duplin, father of the late Judges W. R. and O. H. Allen, cast 17 votes in the caucus for Judge Warren for Senator. On every ballot he voted for Vance. Finally he took the floor and told his friends that the same criticisms they had of Vance, applied with equal force to himself, and urged their support of the war governor. Vance got two majority in the caucus and was elected, but was not seated for that term.

At the same session, the Democrats, eager for constitutional reform, passed a bill for a convention, against the protests and rulings of Lieutenant Governor Caldwell, the day before he took over the governor's office. After he became the governor, he still insisted upon his opposition, and though the bill had been passed by both houses, he asked the supreme court for an opinion on its constitutionality. The court, merely upon the governor's request, filed an opinion, unfavorable to the action of the legislature, and then a storm broke out. On April 5, 1871, they adopted a resolution that an opinion of the supreme court, in a case not properly constituted, had no binding force or effect, and that the governor, having no veto power, could not sit in judgment on an act of the legislature and nullify it. The supreme court was reminded rather sharply to attend to its own business.

Judge Warren was outraged by such a procedure on the part of the governor, and led the attack on him in a speech continuing for three days. The Wilmington Star mentioned his application of Webster's reference to the vigilance of the "unhooded hawk" in his reply to Governor Caldwell's message, and said that he came as near as any man to realizing his own wish, that his "words might be as cannon-balls." "His powers of sarcasm," said the article, "were simply terrific with his reference to the kitchen cabinet, and Snug, the joiner, and his 3-day speech on the governor will stand out as a famous philippic in legislative history."

The convention was submitted to the people, but the Grant administration was powerful enough to defeat it. Judge Warren, however, was again elected as the delegate from Beaufort.

A notable session had ended, conspicuous in its personnel and far reaching in its accomplishments. Comparison is always invidious. Certainly, the great internal-improvement program of the legislature under Governor Morehead will forever stand out. The bodies of 1887 and 1899 were splendid assemblages. In future years the general assembly of 1921 will be pointed to with pride by reason of its initiation of the road program and its vision for the educational and charitable institutions. It has been said that the house of 1923 was the strongest of a



quarter of a century. But the outstanding session of the General Assembly of North Carolina in the entire history of the State was that of 1870-71, when, under the leadership of brave and courageous men, the State was rescued from despotism and her bow once more pointed to ideals that Carolinians revere.

Judge Warren returned home upon the adjournment of the legislature a hopeless invalid, his body racked with muscular rheumatism, and the wheel chair he had been forced to take in Raleigh now became permanent. But his courage did not abate, and daily he was rolled to his office and the courthouse, and the firm of Warren, Carter & Myers had a law practice requiring the time of all of them.

In 1872 Colonel Carter received the Democratic nomination for Congress from the first district, to oppose the incumbent, Clinton L. Cobb, of Elizabeth City. While dominant in a courthouse and in the legislature, he was handicapped by not knowing how to make a political speech. He and his friends made a thorough canvass of the district, but he was defeated. It was used against Colonel Carter in that campaign, with some effect, that his name had appeared as a member of the Republican State executive committee in 1867, which, as already explained, he had disavowed.

By 1874 the Democrats had made such progress that they had already captured one of the Senatorships and five of the seven Representatives in Congress, and a wave of enthusiasm swept the East in the effort to redeem that section. About this time there arose out of the county of Hertford, Maj. Jesse J. Yeates, a former Confederate soldier and orator of much reputation, and one of the many able men that county has contributed to the State. Cobb, in Congress, had voted for the civil rights bill, and when Major Yeates secured the Democratic nomination, that became the sole issue. They met in joint debate in the Beaufort County courthouse to the edification of the Democracy. Major Yeates beginning his speech, informed the crowd that he was going to "take the corn off the Cobb," and he did it to their great delight. The next day he moved on to what was known as Barrows Fork, in Beaufort County, where they came from every section to hear him. So pleased were the people with his speech that they forthwith changed the name of the place to Yeatesville, which is to-day a prosperous community. Many years later, the polished Senator Matt W. Ransom came down from Northampton and delivered a speech at North Creek. He made such an impression on that locality that its citizens named the place Ransomville.

The Democrats, still in control of the legislature, submitted another convention bill, and the battle for the election of delegates was now on. Judge Rodman, still on the supreme court, became a candidate from Beaufort. The papers and political pamphlets of that day disclose that he did so with some reluctance, and that he was more or less drafted to make the race. It was felt that he had rendered such a high order of service in the convention of 1868 that the State should avail itself of his valuable experience. But political lines were tightly drawn, and the Democratic State committee was urging no compromise, especially as the Republicans were against the call for the convention.

So a young man who had moved to Washington from Virginia and became associated with Major Sparrow and had already made his mark after five years at the bar was named as the Democratic candidate. His name was James E. Shepherd, later to become a superior court judge and then chief justice of the supreme court. It was a very close contest, many Democrats casting complimentary votes for Judge Rodman, who was, however, defeated by a small majority. Judge Shepherd was one of the leaders in the convention of 1875.

In the spring of 1875 Judge Edwin G. Reade, of the supreme court, moved to Washington, induced to go there by his friend, Judge Rodman. For three years Washington had two members of the supreme court. Judge Reade owned the home where the writer was born, which was purchased from him by the writer's father after Judge Reade had left the bench and moved to Raleigh. He made himself most agreeable to the people of Washington, who were willing to overlook his bitter political proclivities and admire his brilliant intellect and judicial decisions.

It was about this time that Fenner B. Satterthwaite died. He was a most remarkable man. Many years prior to the war he had been cast into a debtors' prison in Beaufort County, and while there studied law and upon his release was admitted to practice. He had high ability and honored the profession. After the war this old Whig rendered yeoman service to the Democratic Party.

In the early part of July, 1876, two men rode into Washington in the same carriage, followed by a cheering throng on horseback and foot. They repaired to a grove to address the multitude. One was Zebulon B. Vance, the greatest of all war governors of the Confederacy, and for the time denied his seat in the United States Senate by the reconstruction acts. This former Whig leader and friend of the Union was now the Democratic nominee for Governor of North Carolina. The other was Judge Thomas Settle, of the supreme court, an ante bellum Democrat and now the Republican nominee.

It was a brilliant debate and issues only were discussed, each side receiving equal applause from their partisans. It was the last political act of Judge Warren. He struggled out of his rolling chair and introduced Vance, at the same time paying tribute to Settle, who had been active in 1866 in making him a superior court judge. In the election,

Beaufort County gave Vance 137 majority, and it was the first time in the history of the county that it had ever given its popular approval to a Democratic candidate for governor. Three months later Tilden got a small majority, that being also the first instance where a Democratic candidate for President had ever carried it.

On December 10, 1876, Judge Edward J. Warren died. Physical suffering had made his last years ones of torture. He was only 50 years of age, but he was considered an old man. Of stern exterior, with sharp likes and dislikes, he was not a popular man, as the term is generally understood. But the people believed in him, and delighted to do him honor. His life since maturity had been one of constant storms. Uncompromising in his beliefs and opinions, fighting always for his well-thought-out and considered views, regardless of public approbation, he became one of the central figures in great constitutional, legislative, and judicial struggles, when liberty almost disappeared in North Carolina. He detested politics, yet he was thrown in their very vortex for nearly 30 years. He had a duty to perform, a high and lofty one, as he conceived it, and he did it. At a meeting of the bar and citizens, presided over by Colonel Carter, he was paid notable tributes. Judge Rodman came down from the Supreme Court and read the obituary he had prepared. The brilliant Maj. Louis C. Latham and Col. Edward C. Yellowley came from Pitt, and James Edwin Moore from Martin. Death had stayed the hand of politics, and friends and foes gathered.

Upon the death of Judge Warren, his law partner, Colonel Carter moved to Raleigh, where he at once took the position his wealth, character, and capacity commanded. He became director of the Raleigh National Bank and Home Insurance Co., member of the executive committee of the trustees of the university, the chairman of the commission to build the governor's mansion, and chairman of the board of the State's prison. He died in January, 1879, at the age of 49. His was another stormy life, filled with combat.

In 1881 Beaufort County again called on Maj. Thomas Sparrow and sent him to the house. His courtly manner and gentle spirit, his lofty ideals but firm convictions, made him almost venerated in the general assembly. His life was closed on January 14, 1884, at the age of 64.

In 1878, upon the expiration of his term on the supreme court, and after a service of 10 years on that tribunal, Judge William B. Rodman returned to Washington. He immediately entered into a large and lucrative practice, which continued to his death. It was nothing unusual to see this writer and expounder of the constitution arguing a question of law before some justice of the peace perched on a cracker box in some store where he held court. One time one of the members of the bar, knowing Judge Rodman was to try a case before the justice where the point involved had been decided by the supreme court against the contention Judge Rodman was now about to make, slyly informed the justice that he should read the opinion in that case. When Judge Rodman had finished his elaborate argument the justice with great glee confronted him with an opinion adverse to his argument written by himself when a member of the court. Judge Rodman quickly replied that since writing that opinion he had imbibed greater wisdom, and he was now stating exactly what the law should be. His practice carried him in all the courts in the adjoining counties, where he was esteemed, admired, and respected. After leaving the bench he never again took any interest in politics, feeling that his mission in that field had been accomplished. All of his family and descendants have been active Democratic leaders.

In the evening of his life he sat in his library, with his ever-present long-stem clay pipe, surrounded with his books. He died March 7, 1893, at the age of 76, leaving a lasting impression on the constitutional and judicial history of North Carolina. He outlived all of his old contemporaries at the bar.

Richard S. Donnell, Edward Stanly, Edward J. Warren, Fenner B. Satterthwaite, David M. Carter, Thomas Sparrow, and William B. Rodman were now all dead, and the last of the illustrious ante and post bellum bar had passed off the scene. Most of them had seen the beginning of new faces coming on in their stead, for with 1870 and extending through the eighties, a procession of able, brilliant, and capable men started out to constitute the bar of Washington for another era. James E. Shepherd, George H. Brown, George Sparrow, Charles F. Warren, John H. Small, William B. Rodman, and Enoch S. Simmons made up this array and took high rank in the profession.

There has been no attempt in these articles to present the congressional records of Stanly and Donnell. The former, on account of his long service in Congress, was a recognized Whig leader, and exerted commanding influence. He was a close friend of Clay and Webster. Mr. Donnell retired from choice after serving only one term. Nor has there been any attempt to go into the legislative acts bearing the names of Mr. Donnell, Judge Warren, Major Sparrow, or Colonel Carter. At the time they served the judiciary committee was all powerful, and was only composed of a select few in each house, so the first three either introduced or sponsored a large part of the important legislation of that period. Both Stanly and Donnell were speakers of the house at critical periods in the State's history. The activities of Mr. Donnell, Mr. Satterthwaite, Judge Warren, and Judge Rodman in the several constitutional conventions and the work of the latter two on the superior and supreme courts have also been slightly touched upon. Above

everything else, all of these men were lawyers. The articles have dealt more with their political activities in a trying time in the State's history. It has been felt that the important rôles they played have not been given the recognition justly due them. Actuated naturally by county pride, and with a deep appreciation of their works, these pen pictures of her sons are presented as Beaufort County's contribution to a notable era of North Carolina history.

#### CONSOLIDATION OF VETERANS' ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10630) to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate government activities affecting war veterans.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HALE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the committee rose the first section of the bill had been read and sundry amendments had been adopted. There is no pending amendment and the section is still open to amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota if we can not change this bill so as to create a bureau of veterans' affairs in the Department of the Interior, to be administered by an assistant Secretary of the Interior for veterans' affairs? If the gentleman will accept an amendment of this kind it will accomplish what he seeks to do in the way of unification and coordination and at the same time will remove the objections of those who are apprehensive over what will happen to the Pension Bureau in the event the legislation is passed in its present form.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. KNUTSON. To create a bureau of veterans' affairs in the Department of the Interior. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] will agree with me that doing business with an independent bureau is not satisfactory. I think it should be the policy of Congress to discourage the creation of independent bureaus.

I have here an amendment which I would substitute for the measure we have under consideration. It accomplishes everything that the gentleman seeks to do, and I think we could put the bill through as amended in half or three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I may state that the voluminous hearings held on the pending bill indicate that the veterans' organizations speaking for the World War veterans are opposed to a consolidation under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me ask the gentleman what percentage of all the veterans these organizations represent. If we are going to legislate just the way we are asked by the various organizations throughout the country, we might as well abdicate and let them come in here and legislate direct.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I believe the gentleman himself gives a little thought to the wishes of the representatives of these great veterans' organizations.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. I yield to none in my loyalty and interest in the veterans and I am always ready to hear their representatives.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may state to the gentleman that to undertake at this late stage of the game to transfer these activities to the Interior Department would involve practically a rewriting of the whole bill and I think it would be utterly impossible to do it at this late hour.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman that I have a bill that has been very carefully thought out and one that I think will accomplish the purpose. In a nutshell the whole thing is that it will create a bureau of veterans' affairs in the Department of the Interior, with an Assistant Secretary of the Interior to be known as the assistant secretary of the interior for veterans' affairs, who will have full charge of all these matters.

Mrs. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman know—and I am sure he does—that under President Hoover, when he was Secretary of Commerce, the Department of Commerce rose from the least efficient department of the Government to the most efficient department in the Government? President Hoover apparently approved of this bill. Why can not we give him a chance to see what he can do with this organization plan? If you will

give him this opportunity, I believe that you will have the best organization for veterans' affairs that you have ever had.

Mr. KNUTSON. The lady from Massachusetts must realize that the responsibility for legislation lies not with the President but with Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS. I know that is true, but we have a high regard for the ability of the President as an organizer, and Congress can well follow his recommendations.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have been giving consideration to veterans' legislation for the past 14 years, and I am satisfied that we are going to aggravate a badly aggravated situation if we pass this legislation in its present form. I am very apprehensive of it—based upon the 14 years' experience in veterans' legislation.

Mr. MAAS. The President has general charge and jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, as he has of the other departments.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely; and it should be the policy of Congress to reduce the number of independent bureaus.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Does this include all veterans' legislation under this one department?

Mr. KNUTSON. All veterans' activities.

Mr. COLE. The Veterans' Bureau would go out of existence?

Mr. KNUTSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. May I inquire of the gentleman if he intends to offer a complete substitute bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman would not offer it at this stage?

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought if we were going to do anything like that, it might be offered now in the interest of economy of time.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I question whether his amendment might not be subject to a point of order. The gentleman is proposing to do something entirely different from what is contemplated in the pending bill.

Every organization in the country has appeared before our committee through its representatives and agreed that for the time being the thing to do is to consolidate the national homes, the Veterans' Bureau, and the Pension Bureau into an independent establishment, because the three combined activities are larger than any department of the Government to-day, and until we have an opportunity to reorganize the Interior Department we think it would be better for the time being, at least, to keep them independent. The committee felt that for the time being the best way to handle the situation was to create an independent establishment, and if at some future time the situation should be such that we could put it into some department, it could readily be done. At the present time it would overload any department into which it might be put.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is one of the objections I have. We are playing the old policy of mañana—to-morrow—at some future date we will correct the evils that are cursing us. Why not take the situation by the horns now and do what we have ultimately got to do if we are to have satisfactory relief?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think the veterans who are to be benefited ought to have some voice with respect to the character of organization which is to supervise their affairs. I do not think we should entirely ignore them in this matter. They are unanimous, as far as I know, in insisting at least for the time being upon an independent unit for the management of veterans' affairs.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say that I have received scores of letters in the past week commending the stand I am taking with reference to the bill that has been prepared by the gentleman's committee. Every veteran who has had trouble in the Veterans' Bureau—I am safe in saying—is in favor of the substitute legislation.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, let me suggest that the customary course would be to offer the substitute to section 1 of the pending bill, with notice that if agreed to the gentleman would move to strike out the succeeding sections of the Williamson bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I shall give the gentleman a copy of the bill. Perhaps I should have done that before.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. After we finish the reading of the bill under consideration the gentleman can offer a substitute for the whole bill.



Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell us what he is proposing?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Virginia is aware that the purpose of the legislation we are now considering is to consolidate and coordinate all veterans' activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some of us would like to find out what the parliamentary situation is. Has the gentleman from Minnesota made any concrete proposal?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I have offered a proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has offered a pro forma amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is discussing the pro forma amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not exactly a pro forma amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us find out what the parliamentary situation is.

The CHAIRMAN. The first section of the bill has been read and is still open to amendment. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Minnesota to move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Minnesota disclaims that it is a pro forma amendment that he has offered.

Mr. KNUTSON. I took the time in order to explain to the gentleman from South Dakota, the chairman of the committee, that I have a measure I would like to offer as a substitute. I have not as yet offered it as I first wanted to explain what it is. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] asked me a question which I was about to answer when the gentleman from Alabama rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Still reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's purpose to offer a substitute?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman will have to offer it on this section?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the aim of the bill under consideration is to consolidate and coordinate. I think there is no difference of opinion upon the necessity and advisability of taking that action, but I am proposing to offer a substitute for the bill we are now considering, which creates an independent bureau to handle all veterans' activities. I want to transfer the Veterans' Bureau over to the Department of the Interior, to be administered directly under an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for veterans' affairs, and if the aim of Congress is to coordinate and consolidate, I can not see how anyone can possibly object to the substitute I am about to offer.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I understood the gentleman a while ago, he said he proposed to follow his motion, in case the substitute should be adopted, by motions to strike out the other sections of the bill under consideration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; the entire measure.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I take it the committee has not had any chance to consider the gentleman's substitute. Has it been considered by any committee?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the substitute was presented to the committee early in the history of the legislation.

Mr. COLTON. Is this in substance the bill that was suggested by the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to offer it as a substitute at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman state that he proposes to offer a substitute for the entire bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a substitute for section 1, with notice that I shall move to strike out the remaining sections of the bill under consideration as they are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is in order. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KNUTSON: Strike out all of section 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, to be known as assistant secretary of the interior for veterans' affairs, who shall perform such duties in

the Department of the Interior as may be prescribed by the Secretary, or as required by law, and specifically to coordinate and administer agencies dealing with veterans' affairs now existing in the Department of the Interior or which may hereafter be transferred thereto as hereinafter provided.

"Sec. 2. That the President is hereby authorized, by Executive order, so soon as orderly administration will permit, to transfer to the Department of the Interior, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Reserve, and the United States Veterans' Bureau, to the end that said agencies, together with the Pension Bureau already in the Department of the Interior may continue to function as administrative units under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior; and general supervision of the powers and duties now conferred by law upon the several agencies named in respect to the activities so transferred are hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior: And, provided, That the transfer of employees under this authority shall not be held to affect their status under the laws relating to the competitive classified civil service, or under the civil service retirement act, except as may be expressly provided by the President in the exercise of his authority under existing laws.

"Sec. 3. Upon transfer of the administration of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, pursuant to the preceding section, all duties and authority relating to the home as are now imposed on the Secretary of War by the act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. 412); act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 653); act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 359); and the act of October 2, 1888 (25 Stat. 543), shall vest in the Department of the Interior. Section 4835 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 4. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the President is hereby authorized to make proper transfer of all moneys appropriated for the benefits of the respective governmental agencies, the duties and powers of which may be transferred under this authority: Provided, That any moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive or administrative department, or governmental agency, transferred under the authority of this act shall be expended only for the purposes for which they were appropriated."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment is not germane to section 1 of the bill, or as a substitute to the bill before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It is up to the gentleman from Minnesota, I guess.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no; I think not. The gentleman from South Dakota has brought an indictment against my amendment, and it is up to him now to present a bill of particulars.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee is a bill which consolidates all veterans' activities in a new agency known as the administration of veterans' affairs, and creates a head for that establishment who is given control of the three activities. The amendment now proposed as a substitute to section 1 seeks to transfer the three activities into the Department of the Interior, creating a new position of Assistant Secretary, who will have some sort of supervision of the three activities without being given any definite duties with respect to them.

The gentleman's amendment proposes to leave all existing activities entirely intact. There is, in fact, no consolidation at all. All it does is to bring them in together and put them into the Department of the Interior, with some undefined supervisory powers on the part of the Secretary, but with no power to control the activities or do anything effective toward coordination of activities. In other words, the amendment has an entirely different purpose in mind.

The bill before the House is a real consolidation bill, which brings the units together under one supervising head and makes them subject to the direction and control of the administrator. The proposed amendment simply transfers the activities and places them under the Secretary of the Interior, but continuing the board of managers with the same power to function as it has now. The Secretary of the Interior would have no power to control that body, but at best could only act in an advisory capacity. The same is true with respect to the Veterans' Bureau. The Pension Bureau is now subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of the Interior, and presumably would continue to function exactly as it does now.

So that it seems to me this amendment has an entirely different purpose in mind. The bill authorizes the President to consolidate the activities. The proposed substitute does nothing of the sort.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Williamson] has made a very able explanation as to the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. The purpose of

the bill is to consolidate and coordinate. The bill that we are now considering proposes to put the Pension Bureau in with the Veterans' Bureau. My proposal is to place the Veterans' Bureau with the Department of the Interior, under an assistant secretary of the interior for veterans' affairs.

I can not for the life of me see where there is any conflict. The purpose of the proposal to consolidate and to coordinate is to give greater efficiency in the administration of veterans' affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman does not contend that the bill he offers as a substitute would in any way curtail the functions of the Veterans' Bureau or the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers or the Pension Bureau, or that it would give any real control to the Secretary of the Interior of the Veterans' Bureau or the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers? You are not conferring any real power or function on the Secretary of the Interior; neither are you transferring the functions of these bureaus to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. KNUTSON. What do you propose to do with the national homes?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. To consolidate them and bring into the general system.

Mr. KNUTSON. What do I propose to do—to eat them? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. You are not doing much of anything with them. We shall still have three separate activities.

Mr. KNUTSON. The purposes of both are identical. My amendment proposes to place the Veterans' Bureau under the Department of the Interior. The gentleman's bill proposes to take the Soldiers' Home and the Pension Bureau into the bureau of veterans' affairs. The only difference is as to the method. We are both aiming at the same thing, and so far as that goes I concede that the affairs of the veterans would be ably administered either way. But my purpose in offering the amendment is to give the Veterans' Bureau the benefit of the 150 years of valuable experience gained by the Pension Bureau. The Secretary of the Interior has the right under the amendment offered by myself to promulgate new rules and regulations for the administration of the bureau as he may deem expedient and necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in order to determine whether the amendment is germane to the pending bill, the main purpose of the bill is to be sought, and then determine whether the details of the bill offered as a substitute are germane to that main purpose. The main purpose of the bill is first to be sought from the title. I admit that the title is not conclusive as to the scope of the bill, but always the drafter of a bill does attempt to give its general purpose in the title. The Williamson bill has this title:

A bill to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans.

That might be assumed, until something to the contrary appears, to be the expression of Judge WILLIAMSON, the author of the bill, as to its purpose, as he has expressed it in its title.

The Knutson substitute reads, in the title:

A bill to authorize the President to coordinate governmental activities and agencies affecting war veterans and pensioners.

It is identical as far as the meaning is concerned. One is to "consolidate and coordinate." The other is to "coordinate governmental activities," by this consolidation, of course.

When you come to the text of the bill itself, Mr. Chairman, not leaving it alone to a comparison of the titles, it is to be remembered that the Williamson bill now before the House is not the Williamson bill that was reported by the committee. Since its being reported an operation has been performed upon it, and a subdivision of section 1 has been eliminated, subsection (b). Subsection (b), it is to be assumed, meant something. I do not believe that committee would have reported out a subsection that did not mean anything. Its elimination has been agreed to, and that subdivision that was formerly in the bill and is no longer in the bill, gave the President the power to consolidate, eliminate, and redistribute functions. That subdivision has been taken out of the bill.

The bill no longer carries that language authorizing the President to redistribute its functions. The bill carries only this language:

The President is authorized to consolidate and coordinate any hospitals and executive and administrative bureaus, etc., concerned in the administration of the laws relating to veterans.

The Knutson bill is not identical. There would be no point in offering a substitute if it were to be identical, but it is very

similar as to the scope of the authority. The President is authorized to appoint an assistant secretary of the interior and specifically—

To coordinate and administer agencies dealing with veterans' affairs now existing in the Department of the Interior or which may thereafter be transferred thereto as hereinafter provided.

The balance of the bill provides for the transfer.

I am not personally particularly enthusiastic about the substitute bill. I do not think it cures all the evils of the Williamson bill, but it does appeal to me as germane and in order and proper to come before the House for its determination of this problem. The main feature of each bill is that there be a bringing together, a coordination, of the agencies having to do with veterans' affairs. That is the main purpose of each bill. Just how that is to be best done the House should have the opportunity to determine. Whether it shall be as the Williamson bill provides, by the establishment of a new, independent agency, or whether it shall be through consolidation within the existing departments of the Government, is a detail of the plan that the House should have an opportunity to determine. But the main feature of each bill is the bringing together of these veterans' activities.

That being true, the Knutson substitute would be germane to the bill.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman, an examination of the first paragraph of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] discloses that it purports to create an assistant secretary of the interior and to confer upon him not only duties which may be germane to the legislation, H. R. 10630, but any other duties which may be assigned to him by the Secretary of the Interior.

In other words, the substitute as offered is not a substitute for the pending legislation but is for the creation of a new office with broad powers, in no way specified or mentioned in the act. Without some limitation on the scope of that authority to the provisions of the bill for which it is offered as a substitute, it seems to me clearly a broader piece of legislation, having relation to subject matter not in the contemplation of nor within the jurisdiction of the committee reporting this bill. This committee would have no authority, I take it, to report legislation relating to the internal structure of the Department of the Interior or the creation of an assistant secretaryship in that department for the general functions of the department.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORT. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] would never admit that his committee did not have that jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, it does have that jurisdiction.

Mr. FORT. If the committee has jurisdiction, it has not reported a bill relating to the creation of such an office or the conferring upon the Secretary of the Interior of power to give to this administrative officer such powers and functions and duties as he may see fit to assign, whether relating to veteran activities or any of the other duties assigned by law to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT] is aware of the fact that the Williamson bill creates an administrator of veterans' affairs. Is that not a new office?

Mr. FORT. It creates an administrator of veterans' affairs, not as an officer of the Department of the Interior, and not as an officer to whom the Secretary of the Interior may assign duties having nothing whatever to do with veterans' activities, nor may anyone else so assign duties to him. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] creates an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as may be prescribed by the Secretary or as may be required by law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to paragraph (b) of section 1 of the Williamson Act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is out of the bill now.

Mr. KNUTSON. That was stricken out. But, even though it were stricken out, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT] will nevertheless admit that because of the fact that the amendment which I offered will broaden the scope of the work, it does not make it not germane.

Mr. FORT. The point I make is that under the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] the Secretary of the Interior would have authority to transfer to this newly created Assistant Secretary the duties of the Bureau of Mines, the duties of any other part of the Department of the Interior, whether or not those duties had any reference to veterans' affairs, whereas the bill as introduced by the committee



limits the functions of the administrator to those matters relating to veterans' activities.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to again call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the bill before the House simply seeks to consolidate and coordinate the Veterans' Bureau, the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the Bureau of Pensions in an establishment to be known as administration of veterans' affairs. That is a separate and distinct establishment, independent, under the President.

Now, what does the substitute propose to do?

The President is hereby authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional Secretary of the Interior, to be known as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Veterans' Affairs, who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as may be prescribed by the Secretary or be required by law.

The proposed substitute sets up an entirely separate and distinct establishment and bears no relation to what the bill is seeking to do. It does not consolidate these activities in a new department, but simply in general terms provides that they shall be placed under the Secretary of the Interior and creates the office of an Assistant Secretary, who is made subject to the orders of the Secretary. His powers and duties are not defined, but it is simply provided that they shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. It seems to me there is a very clear distinction between the bill and the substitute. The bill proposes a method of consolidation, creates a new establishment, and defines the powers of its administrator. This establishment is made independent. The proposed substitute proposes not to consolidate, or even coordinate, but to bring the three activities into the Department of the Interior, giving to the Secretary only a very limited supervisory function. Not only is the purpose not the same but it in effect creates an entirely separate and distinct set-up and administration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HALE). The Chair feels that the question on the point of order is very close. The substitute obviously seeks to accomplish the same end which section 1 seeks to accomplish and which the original bill seeks to accomplish. The substitute is offered as a substitute for section 1, but is in effect a substitute for the entire bill. It seeks, however, the end sought by the original bill, but by an entirely different method.

The Chair calls attention to a ruling by Chairman Sanders on May 24, 1924, in the Committee of the Whole House, where this rule was laid down—Cannon's Precedents, section 9777:

One of the functions of the rule requiring germaneness is to avoid consideration of legislation which has not been considered in committee, and for this reason the rule should be invoked with particular strictness against amendments proposing substitutes for an entire bill.

To a proposition to effect a purpose by one method a proposal to effect the same purpose by a different and unrelated method is not germane.

The Chair feels that the balance on this question rests on the strict interpretation of that rule, and is of the opinion that the substitute is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I simply want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that if we are to have a bill consolidating the various veterans' activities let us have a bill that means something. As the bill now stands it is weak, and unless the committee can succeed in eliminating the amendment heretofore adopted—that is, the proviso added to section (a), and restoring section (b) to the bill, we might as well vote to strike out the enacting clause. Section (b) takes the real power away from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think not. While I consider subdivision (b) an important provision, as the gentleman knows—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Otherwise you would not have put it in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yet I do not believe it is fatal to have it stricken out, because the gentleman will note that section 2 prescribes that the duties, powers, and jurisdiction of the Soldiers' Homes Board, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, and the Commissioner of Pensions shall be transferred to the new administrator. Another section provides that the administrator shall make such rules and regulations as will properly correlate and coordinate the three activities. We do not give the administrator the broad powers which I thought he should have but nevertheless even with subdivision (b) of section 1 out he would still have sufficient power to make an effective reorganization.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will concede that by the amendment the Pension Bureau is left intact.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; we are keeping the Pension Bureau in.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The adopted amendment provides that the Pension Bureau shall not be abolished. I fear that would prevent any change in the Pension Bureau, even to coordinate it with the other activities of the newly created bureau.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No, indeed. The Pension Bureau is in.

Mr. KNUTSON. If it were, we would allow you to pass the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that he should protect his bill. Let us not make a mess of it, as happened a few days ago.

The President of the United States has demonstrated a genius for organization. Why not give him full power to take these three separate activities and all odds and ends and put them in one department? If you are going to do that, let us do it. Let us give him full power to take all the veterans' activities and place them in one department. We discuss so much the duplication of effort and the waste and efficiency of the various bureaus of the Government and now that we have the opportunity of doing a constructive piece of work there seems to be so much opposition. I do not care in what particular department you place these bureaus and offices as long as you place all of the veterans' activities in one department. I think it will reduce the cost and increase the efficiency.

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This being so, it is difficult on the spur of the moment, I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], to accept a substitute that we have not had an opportunity to consider.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. During the time we were debating this bill the other day I made the statement myself that subsection (b) was the very heart of the bill, but a subsequent study of the bill has convinced me there is still left in the bill enough to make it a good bill if we will protect what is left.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly; but, of course, subsection (b) was not put there with any idle purpose. It was put there to give broad power to the President to reach out and bring into one department all activities; and to remove, to appoint, to eliminate, to change, and to do everything necessary to establish a consolidated department taking over all veteran activities.

Mr. COLTON. And I may say to the gentleman I believe it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do, too.

Mr. COLTON. But I still believe, I repeat, there is sufficient left in the bill to make it a good, workable bill if we will protect what is left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it understood that the bill now is sufficiently broad to bring in the Pension Bureau?

Mr. COLTON. I so understand.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We have to compromise in matters of legislation, and it is a calamity, in my judgment, that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions, both appointees of the President of the United States, are putting every stumblingblock they possibly can in the way of carrying out this consolidation program, which is favored by the President.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is big enough, I am sure, to step over any stumblingblock. That is what we are here for. We can listen to the opinions and to the recommendations of all officials and consider their departmental pride, but the caution I want to throw out now is that we should not go amendment mad on this bill, as we did a few days ago. If we are going to have a consolidation bill, let us have one that will contain the necessary power to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 1, line 9, strike out the words "the Bureau of Pensions."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 1, line 9, after the word "including," strike out the words "the Bureau of Pensions."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have offered the amendment that meets my prime objection to the bill. The bill is urged as an economy measure. So

far as the Veterans' Bureau is concerned, what effect it may have on that bureau to change the title of the chief officer from director to administrator, or something of the kind, I am not aware. This may save a good many million dollars, although I doubt it. The same individual, exercising the same functions, with a different salary and a different title, is apt to give about the same results.

So far as the consolidation of the hospitals and the homes is concerned, I suspect there is an opportunity to accomplish something there, but as to these matters I am not well informed.

I think I do know something about the operation of the Bureau of Pensions, but I say to the House that the passage of this legislation instead of resulting in economy will cost the Government at least one-half million dollars of salary increases and increase of personnel in the Bureau of Pensions after its transfer.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman is always accurate in his statements and has had a great deal of experience on the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior; will the gentleman state how it will increase the cost to consolidate and decrease the cost by leaving out the Pension Bureau?

Mr. CRAMTON. In this way. The Bureau of Pensions is now administered very economically both as to the number of personnel and as to salaries paid them. It is to be remembered that compared with the Veterans' Bureau the Bureau of Pensions is a very small affair. It is so small that it will not appreciably affect the Veterans' Bureau, but the Veterans' Bureau will affect it. The policies and the practices of the Veterans' Bureau as to number of personnel and as to salaries paid them will at once become the standard for the Bureau of Pensions and this very fact alone will mean an increase of at least one-half million dollars in expense to the Government.

It is true I handle the appropriation bill that carries the appropriations for the Bureau of Pensions, and some may be unkind enough to think that because of this fact I am jealous of losing a little power or authority. It happens, however, that in that part of the Interior Department appropriation bill there are no policies to be determined, there is no opportunity for exercise of power or authority, and I think those familiar with my work here will know that I have enough work to do, and will have enough work to do, even if the Bureau of Pensions is taken out of the Interior Department bill; but I feel I would not be fair with the House if I failed, even in the face of a possible adverse majority, to express my judgment gained by my experience of some 8 or 10 years in handling the appropriations for this bureau. No definite showing has been made of any saving, but there will be salary increases and there will be an increase in the number of the personnel.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Has the gentleman any figures as to the ratio of the expense of administration in carrying on the Bureau of Pensions, compared with the amount appropriated and the ratio of the expense of administration in the Veterans' Bureau, compared with the amount appropriated?

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me ask my friend from Utah, did his committee make any comparisons of salaries now paid in the Bureau of Pensions and salaries now paid in the Veterans' Bureau for the same kind of work? It is my understanding the committee did not. It would have been a very pertinent line of inquiry for the committee. If they had made the investigation, they would have found that for the same kind of work much less is paid in the Bureau of Pensions than in the Veterans' Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, and I am going to try to complete my statement in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman from Michigan will permit, our committee, after very careful investigation, found that there was hardly any place along the line where one can compare the work of the Veterans' Bureau with the work of the Bureau of Pensions. The work parallels in few respects, except certain clerical and investigation work.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that is true, if the committee investigating this question could not find any work or any place where the Veterans' Bureau was performing the same kind of work as the Bureau of Pensions, then how are you getting any economy by a consolidation of diverse activities?

Mr. COLTON. It is true that there is some clerical work that parallels or is duplication.

Mr. CRAMTON. Compare that—compare the director, the legal, the medical, the clerical, the janitor force, and you will find that they are paying more in the Veterans' Bureau. Of course, as soon as this becomes a law you will have to equalize them and bring them up to the Veterans' Bureau standard.

Mr. COLTON. The testimony is that as time goes on there will be a material duplication of work. But the gentleman has not answered my first question.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is practically immaterial—the question I asked the gentleman is of much more importance. Now, I do not want to take much more time; I fear the thing is all set, but I want to be on record as offering the amendment as my best judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does the gentleman think that this is only a question of the efficiency of bureaus? We want to consolidate these activities and this consolidation is broader than that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am as much in sympathy with economy as anyone, but I have not been able to see any economy in this—I have not been able to see any place where a duplication will be eliminated, but I can see where a nice salary increase program is in prospect. Subdivision (b) has been eliminated from the bill, but that major operation does not worry the gentleman from South Dakota as much as you would think.

I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE], on whose motion subdivision (b) was stricken out of the section, that that is the one that seems to have the real power in it, authorizing the President to eliminate and redistribute these functions. Judge WILLIAMSON says that he is satisfied that the elimination of subdivision (b) has not hurt the bill. Why? For the reason that there is no law for any responsibility or authority in the Bureau of Pensions except as the President continues the duties, and the chairman of this committee knows that even with subdivision (b) taken out of the bill the President still, under the authority that the general law gives him, could take every function away from the Bureau of Pensions that he wishes to.

The gentlemen of the committee, the minority, who are following, apparently, the gentleman from South Dakota in going ahead and leaving subdivision (b) out of the bill, have not quite taken into consideration the provisions of the general law that allow the President to entirely emasculate the Bureau of Pensions, but I believe that the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents, the veterans of the Spanish War and their dependents, are still entitled to have one bureau of this Government especially to administer to their needs. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is difficult for me to appreciate the studied and consistent opposition of one of the leaders, if not the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations, to this scientific proposal to try and coordinate the activities of the Government in the administration of the veterans' affairs.

The gentleman from Michigan was one of the leaders who attempted to emasculate the bill, and probably succeeded for the time being by aiding in striking out paragraph (b) of section 1.

Now he wants to go further and destroy one of the high purposes of this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. It would be agreeable to me to restore paragraph (b) if my amendment carries.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; the gentleman is only concerned in retaining the Bureau of Pensions. That seems with him to be sacrosanct. Everybody, except apparently the gentleman from Michigan, knows that the work of the Bureau of Pensions is diminishing. In a few years there will be little work for the Bureau of Pensions. As far as the old soldiers are concerned, the work is being fast concluded. There may be some as to the widows, and especially those widows who have married old soldiers late in life.

There will also be some work for the Spanish-American War veterans, but the hearings before the committee in the consideration of this bill show that 85 per cent of the work of the Veterans' Bureau has become static. With that condition as to World War veterans, what argument can be advanced against coordinating and combining the work of these two bureaus. I have gone through fights where it has been difficult in years back to remove even pension agencies situated throughout the country, one of them in my own city of Milwaukee, and one in Indianapolis—and this was some 25 years ago—at a time when we paid these pensioners through these agencies. We had then the same character of stand-pat opposition—against any reform in abolishing these expensive and unbusinesslike pay agencies. We have now a very similar condition, except that we have the Committee on Appropriations attempting to thwart a scientific



proposal of coordination of activities recommended by the President of the United States. The major argument advanced by the protagonist is that the salaries paid in the Bureau of Pensions are less than the salaries in the Veterans' Bureau. If we are paying niggardly salaries in the Bureau of Pensions, let us increase them. [Applause.] From my reading of the hearings and the report on this bill we should coordinate these activities and should establish an administrator of veterans' affairs who shall have jurisdiction not only of the administration of pensions being paid in diminishing numbers, to Civil War veterans and their widows, and to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, but also the management of the national soldiers' homes and the management of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman think the Veterans' Bureau has all it can attend to without taking over the Pension Bureau?

Mr. STAFFORD. Eighty-five per cent of the cases in the Veterans' Bureau to-day are static. We want a responsible head to advise what work shall be transferred to the Veterans' Bureau and what work shall be transferred to the Pension Bureau. As a scientific accounting system this bill can be defended in toto; but here we find gentlemen trying to emasculate it, first by striking out subsection (b), because seemingly they have a feeling that the rights of some old pensioner may be affected, when the rights of the pensioners are not to be invaded at all. Perhaps the personnel of the Pension Bureau might be invaded, but the rights of the Civil War veterans and the Spanish-American War veterans will not be affected in any way at all. They will continue to get their vouchers every month.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am very anxious not to have this Congress adjourn before passing this extremely constructive act for our disabled veterans. At the beginning of the year I was not at all sure that I was in favor of this measure, but after careful study, after hearing the arguments for and against the bill, to my mind there is but one answer. Why not create this bureau, why not create the position of administrator of veterans' affairs, and take the good that is in each department and consolidate the departments for the welfare of the veterans in order that they may be given better service? I have inspected a good many of the Veterans' Bureau hospitals and soldiers' homes all over the country. I know that the national soldiers' homes have had experience in the domiciliary care of our veterans, and I know that they can do it more cheaply than can the Veterans' Bureau. We need their experience in domiciliary care.

I know that the Veterans' Bureau hospitals, on the whole, provide very much better medical and surgical care for our veterans, and I know that the food is very much better, because I have eaten it in all of the hospitals and soldiers' homes which I have inspected. Take the two, put them together, and I believe you will have more adequate care for the disabled veterans. How can you refuse to do what is going to be of advantage to the disabled? We need the extra domiciliary beds and the extra hospital beds which this consolidation would give us for our disabled men. Since 1919 the Congress of the United States has authorized the Veterans' Bureau to expend over \$104,000,000 in hospital construction, and our subcommittee on veterans' hospitals is now considering bills calling for an additional \$30,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, my amendment does not involve the question of hospitals at all. That consolidation will continue.

Mrs. ROGERS. The gentleman is perfectly willing to have that?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes. I have no objection to that.

Mrs. ROGERS. Does the gentleman think for one minute that the Pension Office knows anything practically about veterans' compensation or the work that the Veterans' Bureau does at the present time? It is highly intricate.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I am not asking that, and that is why I think they should be left distinct. Their fields are entirely different. My amendment proposes only to take the Bureau of Pensions out of this proposed consolidation and to continue the consolidation as to the Veterans' Bureau and hospitals to which the gentleman refers.

Mrs. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman think it is important to have the Pension Bureau together with the other? We are all coming to pensions for veterans of all wars one of these days.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am unable to see any reason for it.

Mrs. ROGERS. I see the greatest possible reason why this bill should become a law. Veterans' relief has been my work since 1917, all day, and sometimes all night until I came to Congress in 1925 and a part of every day since that time.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the gentlewoman is speaking of hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS. I do not think it is possible for the Veterans' Bureau to absorb the Pension Bureau or for the Pension Office to absorb the Veterans' Bureau. I think we should have a new department; the administration of that department will not be, in my opinion, the present head of any department or bureau. It will be a new man.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I am not speaking—

Mrs. ROGERS. The gentleman will have to excuse me; I am sorry. I can not yield further. It will be a new man who can and will consolidate all of the different bureaus, and I believe that in this country of ours there can be found a man who has the ability to take what is good in the different departments and work out a practical plan for veterans' relief. To do so he must have control of all veterans' activities in order that he may have the whole picture before him. Why should we spend more than we need to for our veterans' care in administration? We want to spend wisely, intelligently; we want to give them the best that we have. Saving in overhead costs may mean more money in compensation to the veteran. You can preserve the good in the different departments and weed out the bad. We have extremely able men in the United States, and surely the President can find one to serve as administrator of veterans' affairs who will be able to administer wisely the business of our veterans. I have heard a good deal of criticism of the different heads of the bureaus. I see nothing in this bill that suggests that any present head of any bureau shall be the administrator who would be created under this bill.

I do beg of you to pass a bill which can become a law. On Thursday last we passed a bill which we all know can never become a law, and it makes one's heart ache to feel that it was really just fooling the disabled veterans. I do want one bill passed that is to my mind an intelligent step in the right direction. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have gotten into a mix-up here this morning.

I want to call your attention to this fact that I knew that we were drifting into this situation when this bill was reported. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that I made the suggestion when this bill was reported that it would bring about just what has happened on the floor. This bill was never properly reported out of the committee.

I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that I have not fallen for anything. I have said from the beginning of my remarks that I favored a consolidation of the veterans' activities. I believe they ought to be consolidated. The Pension Bureau and the Veterans' Bureau are doing the same kind of work in the very same way in many instances to-day. There are a whole lot of these activities that ought to be consolidated. One man could attend to the business just as well as half a dozen are doing now in many instances. In this bill we are not considering, we are not approaching, the matter in the proper way. That is why I made the motion to cut out subdivision (b) of the first section. We are told by veterans and it was represented to us in the committee that the veterans of all wars, the representatives of the soldiers' homes, and everybody else that they favored consolidation. If we are legislating for the veterans and trying to do something that they want done, the bill they suggested is the bill that ought to be before the House to-day. I mean the original bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. What kind of a bill was that?

Mr. GASQUE. It was a bill very much like the one we have now, but it did not have in it subsection (b). They were in unanimous agreement in favor of the bill presented by Mr. Means, although we were told later that some of them said they would rather have the original bill. Hearings were not held before the committee on the bill that is now before the House. The hearings were had on a different bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Before the committee?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes; before the committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am surprised at the gentleman's remark. We have been led to believe heretofore that extensive hearings were held on this bill. It seems now that it was an entirely new bill. Is the gentleman from South Dakota trying to flimflam the House?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does the gentleman mean to say I ever made such a statement as that? I did not.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am taking the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. GASQUE. The bill, on which we had extensive hearings, was to consolidate all these activities into the Veterans' Bureau.

Now, I believe the bill as we have it, with this subsection taken out, comes about as near being a bill such as these gentlemen agreed upon as we can get. I would like to see the bill in different shape, but I feel that we ought to make a start and do something that would eventually bring all these agencies under one head.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman tell me the various organizations that are for this bill in its present form?

Mr. GASQUE. I can not give you that information. I have been told that the World War veterans' organization and the American Legion are for it. I was told that the Spanish-American War Veterans were opposed to it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What the veterans are interested in is in the check and not the administrative details.

Mr. GASQUE. If the Johnson bill which came before us the other day contained in it proper administrative features, we would not have had a good bill. That is what we need. That is the reason why we favor the Pension Bureau, because we get better administration of affairs there.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has given considerable study to this subject. Does the gentleman believe we are going to save any money by this proposed consolidation?

Mr. GASQUE. Not at once, but eventually I believe we shall save money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GASQUE. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GASQUE. It is not my opinion that at present there will be any considerable amount of money saved, but if we consolidate these agencies I believe in a few years hundreds of thousands of dollars will be saved. Of course, we are setting up an administrator at a salary of \$12,000 a year and several other agencies. But even so, if the administration is as it should be, we will save a good deal of money in future years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman state whether in his opinion the administration of these various bureaus will be improved in any way by the passage of this bill? Does the gentleman think from his consideration of the subject that there will be anything gained in economy or efficiency next year or the year after, if this bill is passed?

Mr. GASQUE. I can not say that there will be any improvement immediately, but I think in a few years there will be. I can not, of course, prophesy as to the future.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think, in the situation we have here now, that the wise thing to do would be to send this bill back to the committee for reconsideration, in the hope that something may be framed that would give us some better assurance than it affords?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It seems to me a simple proposition, when you have simply the Veterans' Bureau and the soldiers' homes and the Pension Bureau to consolidate.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Are we legislating for the veterans who now receive the money and those on the pay roll or for the entire people?

Mr. GASQUE. I think we should legislate for the veterans, the entire people, and for the Federal Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Do you think this legislation would put anyone off the pay roll if we perchance should pass it?

Mr. GASQUE. I can not say.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the three departments are functioning all right at the present time?

Mr. GASQUE. I did not say that.

Mr. PALMER. Your Pension Bureau has been functioning for over a hundred years and is functioning all right, is it not?

Mr. GASQUE. I think so.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman believe it is good policy to start out on a plan of destruction and to destroy a bureau that we know has been successfully conducted for more than a hundred years?

Mr. GASQUE. I do not.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman not think it would do the veterans a great injustice to consolidate these departments?

Mr. GASQUE. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman that the Pension Bureau has been functioning, as far as I

know, efficiently for 100 years. I would dislike to see anything disrupt it at the present time. However, I want to go further and say that there are functions being performed by the Pension Bureau and the Veterans' Bureau to-day in the same field, where men are overlapping in their work, doing the very same work. An examination and investigation of those matters should be made and certain features ought to be consolidated.

Mr. PALMER. I favor anything that will help the World War veterans and all of the other veterans, but the masses of people throughout the Nation are to be considered and not a few salaries and a few officers. I think it would be a mistake to destroy the Bureau of Pensions.

Mr. GASQUE. As far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to do anything that will destroy it.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that that matter was carefully considered and there was no thought on the part of anyone of injuring the efficiency of any department or bureau, but, on the contrary, we believed that we would greatly increase the efficiency of all of the bureaus.

Mr. GASQUE. In answer to the gentleman's question I want to say that representatives of the old soldiers' homes, the Spanish-American War veterans, and the World War veterans came before us, urging that we do consolidate, but I want to say that they did not agree upon a bill like the one brought in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] will withhold his motion for a moment, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the debate on my amendment close now. I would prefer it, as a matter of fact, but I think that other gentlemen who have important amendments to offer should have a fair opportunity to present them.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If gentlemen would let me see their amendments so that I would know what they were, I might consent to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Even if they do not let the chairman see them, I think they have a right to offer them and debate them. I imagine the great controversy is on this one section.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my motion to move that all debate on this section and the current amendment close in 25 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman make that five minutes more?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the motion if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] withdraws his motion.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment submitted by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held extensive hearings for the past two years on legislation having for its purpose the consolidation of all veterans' activities. While the bill as reported by the committee does not compare word for word with the original bill upon which hearings were held, I do not believe it is the practice of the House, or even the practice of the Committee on Pensions, whose chairman [Mr. KNUTSON] raised such a hullabaloo about not having



hearings on the particular bill before us, to bulletin and hold new hearings every time they adopt an amendment changing a word, dotting an i, or crossing a t, in a bill which such committee is considering.

Mr. Chairman, extensive hearings before the committee indicate that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion were fairly and squarely in favor of consolidating all veterans' activities under one independent bureau.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] speaking in behalf of his amendment stated that it should be adopted because the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the veterans of the Civil War should have an independent agency such as they now have—the Pension Bureau. Refer to page 107 of the hearings. Mr. Rice W. Means, a former Senator from Colorado, testified as follows:

I have authority from 42,000 survivors of the Civil War—written authority—to speak for them before this committee. I am authorized to officially represent the United Spanish War Veterans. As to those two they have expressed themselves in their conventions as being favorable to a joining of all agencies extending relief to veterans of this country under one head. They have both, by resolution, favored the placing of these agencies under the Secretary of the Interior. I don't believe they are married to that particular procedure at all.

On page 62 of the hearings on H. R. 16722, Mr. Means testified further as follows:

First, there ought to be an independent agency to be called the "department of veterans' activities" or "department of veterans' relief."

Further on that page Mr. Means answered this question, propounded by Congressman COLTON:

Mr. COLTON. Do you advocate a consolidation under an existing bureau or the creation of a new department to handle all of these activities?

Mr. MEANS. I advocate the creation of a new department to handle these activities.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, to my mind there is a great difference between the creation of a new department headed by a cabinet officer and the setting up of a vast independent bureau, with the possibility of a repetition of the scandals we have already experienced under the Forbes régime.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Michigan did not listen to the testimony I read and he has not read the testimony, because Mr. Means testified, on page 62 of the hearings, that there ought to be an independent agency to be called the "department of veterans' activities." This bill provides for an independent agency to handle all veterans' affairs. The exact name is not the same as suggested by Mr. Means, but in substance and principle it is the same activity which he suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The bill submitted by Mr. Means—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is in principle practically the identical bill reported out by the Expenditures Committee and now under consideration, the allegations of the devoted disciples of the Commissioner of Pensions to the contrary notwithstanding. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. And sets up a separate department, does it not?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Absolutely. I believe that the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior would be rendering a better service to the country and to the President of the United States who appointed them if they would devote the time which they have been devoting to opposing this consolidation bill to some of the other duties of their offices. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment goes to the heart of the bill in more senses than one. Both of the dominant political parties in this country repeatedly in the platforms on which they have gone to the Nation for election have favored the consolidation of Government departments.

I quote now from the last Democratic national platform:

(a) Businesslike reorganization of all the departments of the Government.

(b) Elimination of duplication, waste, and overlapping.

(c) Substitution of modern businesslike methods for existing obsolete and antiquated conditions.

Similar language is to be found in the platforms of both parties for the last eight years at least.

Modern businesslike methods mean a concentration of like functions and authority in the hands of one man where possible. There are no business organizations in this Nation today which would tolerate any such condition as exists in the Government of the United States where similar functions relating to a like subject matter are scattered in from 3 to 15 different branches of the Government. If we are to be true to the pledges made by our parties, gentlemen on both sides of the aisle should vote for a concentration of these and all other like activities in the Nation under appropriate heads.

The argument is made that this will result in an increase of expenses because the Pension Bureau, it is said, is the most efficient of any of these organizations. If that be true, and the man who is placed at the head to administer all of these like activities is fit for the job, he will adopt the Pension Bureau way of handling such similar functions as are now in the Veterans' Bureau. If he finds a more efficient and better way in the Veterans' Bureau than some method that is in use in the national soldiers' homes, he will use that method. But it is only by giving to one man the point of vantage from which he can view the relative efficiency of methods that you can hope to find which is the most efficient, the most economical, and the most advantageous.

Nobody on this floor or in this Nation knows what may be the next turn in veterans' legislation. Nobody can even guess what form of legislation we or some subsequent Congress will adopt on this subject. But whatever its form, I challenge any Member of this House to deny that a competent administrator in charge of all forms of veterans' legislation will be a better guide as to the method of administration than three segregated and separated administrators, each operating under his own old system which may or may not be efficient.

If the gentleman from Michigan will permit, it is because in part it may be true that the Bureau of Pensions does some things more efficiently that I would like to see it in the same general branch of the Government with those branches which may be operating less efficiently. I have sufficient confidence in the new blood I believe will be at the head of this whole organization to believe that the man named to the job of rendering the whole administration efficient will adopt the best methods which he finds in each of the subsidiary branches.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows there is no question who that will be. It will be the present head of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. FORT. If the gentleman pleases—

Mr. WILLIAMSON. We deny that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Everybody denies that on the floor but admits it in private.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; we do not.

Mr. FORT. The gentleman has made a statement attacking my personal veracity, if the Chair pleases—

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the gentleman knows there was nothing of that kind.

Mr. FORT. Will the gentleman withdraw his remark?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will disclaim any such purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am always willing to do anything I can in the interest of the veterans, but I find myself in a very peculiar situation here, because there is so much division on this very important question. We have a great division of opinion on the Republican side of the House and we have a great division on the Democratic side of the House and it strikes me this is too important a matter to push through rapidly. It occurs to me the best place to send this bill at the present time is back to the committee to the end we may work out something comprehensive, with a view of all getting together and bringing out something that we can support with more unanimity.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say to the gentleman that the committee has had this matter under consideration for two years and if the gentleman will take the time to look at our hearings—

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have looked at the hearings, but I find the bill was introduced on March 10, 1930, and reported back to the House on March 21, 1930, and you are consolidating three or four very important activities of the Government.

My friend here, for whom I have great respect, has a great deal to do with the Interior Department, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], and he is fighting this bill. He has responsible connections with the President and we do not know how the President stands on this bill, and even if we did, I am not sure we would follow him in this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Let me say to the gentleman that the bill the gentleman is holding in his hand is simply a bill that has been amended by the committee. In other words, the committee amended the bill which it had been considering for a long time and reintroduced the bill with the amendments so as not to have a lot of committee amendments in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, the gentleman will give me a little more time—

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; I can not do that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then do not take up all of my time. The gentleman is chairman of the committee and has control of the time.

Now, when I have to deal with the Veterans' Bureau to take up a matter, first I have got to go to Charlotte, N. C.; then I have to appeal from Charlotte to New Orleans, and then back to Washington. This is with respect to Veterans' Bureau. I can go to the Bureau of Pensions and get action immediately.

If you are going to improve conditions, well and good. I want to say on the floor of the House here, I think the head of the Veterans' Bureau, General Hines, is a very high type of man—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I can not yield, because you have taken up all the time on this matter and I have only a few minutes left.

I really think the place this bill ought to go is back to the committee, so we can make a further study of the matter and all of us get together, because, gentlemen, I want to do something for the veterans, but it looks to me that with all this tangled situation we are not going to aid the veterans but rather hamper them. This is the way I feel about it.

I wish I knew what veterans' organizations are for the bill, if any, and who are against it, but I can not find anybody here who can tell me. I know there are no designs on the trestle board and we are in great confusion in the temple and do not know what to do. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am supporting this bill as it came from the committee because it is a good bill and will be beneficial to the veterans as well as the Government. Both in the last Congress and the present Congress hearings were held and we sat for days listening to the views of Government officials, as well as members of veterans' organizations.

No one was denied a hearing and no one was limited as to time. Everyone had a fair opportunity to present their views. The President wants legislation to bring veterans' activities under one head, and this bill is what he desires.

I think it is most unfair for Members of the House, who should know better, to continue to compare the work of the Pension Bureau with the work of the Veterans' Bureau. Everyone who has had any experience in handling veterans' claims before the Pension Bureau knows that the great majority are claims which are automatically allowed when the man proves his service and the examination discloses a disability, regardless of whether he was hit by a street car or fell from a building, or is disabled by a disease, but under the World War veterans' law the Congress required that the disability be of service origin or subject to the presumptive section and there you find an entirely different situation. If the record of the War or Navy Department does not disclose treatment for the existing disability while in the service the veteran must prove his claim that his injury or disease is the direct result of his service. The burden of proof is on the veteran, and there are delays in securing evidence that will enable the bureau to act favorably on the claim. Until the Congress grants pensions to World War veterans, which I hope it does soon, this condition will continue. Therefore Members should not advance the argument that they can get immediate action at the Pension Bureau but are subject to long delays at the Veterans' Bureau. You and you alone can correct this situation by passing the disability pension bill for World War veterans.

If you have a case under the general law and prosecute it before the Bureau of Pensions, you will find you have just as much trouble as you do in handling a case before the Veterans' Bureau. I have had such an experience within the last week. I was before the Pension Bureau the other day with a general law case, and I was amazed to find that the examiner had denied the claim, because he stated the disability existed prior to the service. I could find nothing in the file to show that this man had the disability—tuberculosis—prior to the time he entered the service. He had several enlistments, and when the time came for discharge was held in the service for the convenience

of the Government to determine if he did have tuberculosis. We all know the military officers are not taking men into the service who have tuberculosis. When I complained the papers were reviewed and now have been sent to the field for special examination. Try and get a case closed in the Pension Bureau that goes to the field and you will find it takes several months.

But aside from this, the opportunities will be present to effect economies and to improve the efficiency of the Veterans' Bureau and to expedite the handling of all claims and hospitalization affecting all disabled soldiers.

The bill has the indorsement of all the veterans' organizations, and I do not think this House should fail to give the President the bill he wants to reorganize or consolidate governmental agencies administering laws affecting veterans of all wars.

Mr. CRAIL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CRAIL. I am a friend of the veterans and I am not asking this question in a hostile way, but for information. I would like to know if there is a good reason, and if so what the reason is, why the veterans' affairs should not be under some executive department of our Government.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The outstanding reason I will say to the gentleman from California, is that practically 25 per cent of Government expenditures goes for the care of veterans and it is too big a job to put in the hands of a Cabinet officer who has many other activities to look after. [Applause.] We want one man to look after the veterans and that one man to be held responsible and if he does not take care of the veterans, the Congress of the United States and the President, friends of the veterans, will see that he does properly administer the laws or will get a man who will.

Mr. CRAIL. That does not appeal to me as a very good reason. During the last campaign I heard one of our candidates for President proclaiming loudly on the radio that \$556,000,000 of our Government's money was expended and did not fall within the jurisdiction of any executive department, and that this had increased from approximately \$5,000,000 to this great sum within less than 10 years, and both parties claimed that the work could be consolidated and that the matter should come under the jurisdiction of an executive department.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that this set-up provides the administrator is directly responsible to the President of the United States, and therefore should appeal to the gentleman. The gentleman need have no fear as the veteran's interest will be carefully protected.

Mr. CRAIL. That might be said with reference to a Cabinet officer.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. In the campaigns and in national conventions we all favor reorganization of the Government agencies and we should carry out the promises made at that time.

We should not condemn the Veterans' Bureau and those administering the law when the Congress itself is responsible for the law.

Men who served in the Regular Establishment complain about the general law under which they are pensioned, but the cases are so few in comparison with the number handled by the Veterans' Bureau that you do not get the complaints.

Cases appealed to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior when rejected by the Commissioner of Pensions are not decided the same day. Sometimes it takes several months; always several weeks. I am sure members who have handled cases of this character before the Pension Bureau will agree with me.

Cases sent to the field by the Pension Bureau likewise take months. The examiners travel from place to place, and where the veteran has lived in various parts of the country the papers must be sent to different examiners. So do not compare the administration of claims in the Pension Bureau—those affecting Spanish and Civil War veterans—with claims pending before the Veterans' Bureau. I say again it is not fair. Compare the cases filed under the general pension law and you will see the delay in getting a final decision in the Pension Bureau is experienced the same as you find in the Veterans' Bureau.

I hope the amendment will be defeated and the bill passed as it came from the committee, and I speak as a friend of the veteran, one who has fought their battles before the Pension and Veterans' Bureaus for years. I would do nothing to harm them.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad, gentlemen of the committee, that we are of one accord on one thing and that is that we are all deeply interested in doing the thing that will benefit the veterans most. It seems to me that this discussion has revolved around two distinct aspects—one is the business consideration and the other is a matter of sentiment, pure and simple.



Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is no just reason why we should not, in undertaking to legislate for the veterans, consider all of the well-recognized principles of business that we put into every business organization in the country where affairs are well administered.

What reason can there be, gentlemen, for not consolidating the various veterans' activities? Why, we are told that the Pension Bureau is such a wonderfully efficient bureau, and I agree with that. But, gentlemen, we should understand that the Pension Bureau and the Veterans' Bureau and the soldiers' homes are all Government agencies. Is there anything holy about the Pension Bureau that we should not draw that into a consolidation that will insure unification of administration and guarantee economy and efficiency?

I can not understand the position that some are taking, that because the Pension Bureau is administered more efficiently than the Veterans' Bureau, as has been claimed—and I am not arguing about that—I can not understand why they take the position that if we consolidate and place them under one administrative head that all the defects will come into the administration of the consolidated activities and none of the virtues of the Pension Bureau will be carried over into the administration of the new department.

Are they not all agencies of the Government? Shall one be hallowed and favored over the other? Not at all.

I want to say that I am not in sympathy with the sentiment expressed here that we should legislate in relation to the personnel of any department or bureau. It is not sound legislation that we should come in here and enact legislation to fit an individual, just because he is at the head of one of our bureaus. Legislation should be confined to sound principles of business and economical administration.

For that reason I say that is the sentimental side that has been discussed a great deal. It has been argued that we should not consolidate, because the Veterans' Bureau, perchance, will absorb the Pension Bureau. It is not a case of one bureau absorbing another; it is merely a matter of bringing all together under one administrative head.

Now, the question has been asked over and over again wherein lies the economy? I can not follow that in the few minutes that I have, but only to indicate in a general way. For example, is not the hospitalization of your veterans of the Civil War and the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the veterans of the World War, the same identical thing? I say to you that the hospitalization and the care of the sick of the various wars has the same identical principle involved, and, therefore, they should be under one administrator, one board, and not three boards. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the statement has recently been made that the bill is very involved, complicated, and intricate. The bill, on the contrary, is very simple. It seeks to take the Pension Bureau, now under the Department of the Interior, the soldiers' homes, now administered by a board of volunteer governors, the Veterans' Bureau, an independent office, and consolidate them into one independent agency of the Government. That is all there is to it—to have the three bureaus consolidated under one head.

If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, to eliminate the Pension Bureau is adopted, we might as well send the bill back to the committee, because there is no sense in simply consolidating the Veterans' Bureau with the soldiers' homes.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In a minute. This is a bill that will consolidate these three different bureaus and that is all the bill does. It does not change the pension law, it does not change the veterans' compensation, it does not change the condition for admission into the soldiers' home. It simply brings the three together under one executive head. If you eliminate one of the three, it vitiates the bill. I yield now to the gentleman.

Mr. GASQUE. I understood the gentleman to say that when we struck out subsection (b) we might just as well have sent the bill back to the committee.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am in hope of reinserting section (b). I believe that when we get into the House we will put it back into the bill.

Mr. GASQUE. The gentleman thinks that the bill will be a failure if we leave subsection (b) out of it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think that the bill will be very much stronger with subsection (b) left in. That is all there is to this bill. It is bringing these three different bureaus now having separate distinct jurisdiction over three sets of veterans and putting them under one head. All this talk about the Spanish War veterans and Civil War veterans being in favor of the Pension Bureau is idle. What the veteran is interested in is the results, in getting his pension check every month.

This will expedite the facilities for the veteran in getting speedier action and better service. If we can reduce overhead expense that, too, is for the benefit of the veterans.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. I am very strongly in favor of this bill, fundamentally because I believe that our whole administrative system of Federal Government needs reformation, and that this bill is a move in the right direction. We have 10 departments of our Government, and more than 30 outside agencies which are not coordinated. I can not take the time now to discuss this patchwork, this medley, this haphazard system of unscientific organization which would not be tolerated in private business, and ought not to be tolerated by us who are charged with the responsibility for its reform. But that aside, when this bill was first proposed, it was offered as H. R. 6141, and on behalf of 1,500 veterans of the Central Branch of the Soldiers' Home at Dayton, Ohio, I filed a protest against it (see p. 4551, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28). It was suggested that this protest was brought about by the board of managers, those in control, who wanted to save for themselves the administration of the affairs of the Soldiers' Home. Be that as it may, when the committee had gone more thoroughly into the situation and brought out the bill which we now have before us, I submitted the bill to those who had sponsored the protest, and I shall read now the reply of the commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans camp, of which it is my privilege to be an honorary member:

MAJOR WM. MCKINLEY CAMP No. 91,  
DEPARTMENT OF OHIO,  
Dayton, Ohio, March 20, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: Have received a copy of H. R. 10630 along with a copy of Mr. Williamson's letter of March 13, addressed to you and forwarded to me, and I want you to know that I thank you very kindly, for I have, through studying the bill, become much more familiar with it than I would otherwise have been. I personally think this is very fair bill and just what should be enacted. There is nothing apparently wrong with a bill "authorizing the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans." And I think all veterans of all wars will see this in the same light as I.

I note in Mr. WILLIAMSON'S comment on H. R. 10630 that, "Some fear has been expressed that the proposed set-up might affect the Spanish-American soldiers adversely." But the remainder of that paragraph very ably clinches that argument. I do not believe that the United Spanish War Veterans will object to the proposed consolidation. The thing that is objected to, not only by the Spanish-American soldier but the World War soldier as well, is the turning over of the homes to the Veterans' Bureau. But everyone here seems to be agreeable to the bill H. R. 10630.

M. A. HATHAWAY,  
Commander Camp No. 91.

Mr. Chairman, it is of great importance that the soldiers' home situation be looked into. The Soldiers' Home Board of Managers is not exactly a voluntary board, as suggested by my good friend from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], but is a board elected by Congress. Congress has shown so little care of the soldiers' home that although the term of office of the president of the Board of Managers expired more than five years ago, no attempt has been made by this House to fill the position. The members of the board, except the president, serve without pay. No matter how patriotic or how willing they are, we all know the kind of service that can be expected from men who must serve without pay, who have only their expenses paid, when they must sacrifice much time from their personal affairs to travel from Maine to California and all over the United States. The president of the Board of Managers gets a salary of \$4,000 a year. He is a splendid, an efficient man, and earns much more. He gives virtually all of his time to this work, and I do not believe we shall make any saving if this instrumentality of our Government, the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes is consolidated with any other, because he is less properly and adequately paid than perhaps any man who is charged with a like responsibility under our Government. He deserves to be paid more, and I can say this very freely, because he belongs to the opposite political party to that to which I belong myself. The conditions in the soldiers' home are unsatisfactory. The branches are overcrowded and the hospitals, the food, and living conditions are much below the standard that we may expect from the organization proposed by this bill. I sympathize with those who do not want the present admirable administration of the Pension Bureau interfered with. It seems a model of efficiency and zeal for the veteran. It gives Members of Congress as little trouble as any bureau with which we have to deal, and I am confident that its usefulness and popularity will not be impaired by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including correspondence between a veteran complaining about the soldiers' home conditions, the president of the Board of Managers, and myself, and a letter from a welfare worker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These letters are: Thomas Eaglin to FITZGERALD, March 22, 1930; FITZGERALD to Gen. George H. Wood, president of Board of Managers, March 26, 1930; General Wood to FITZGERALD, April 3, 1930; Eaglin to FITZGERALD, April 12, 1930; Whiteside to FITZGERALD, March 3, 1930; as follows:

TROOP A, FIRST REGIMENT UNITED STATES CAVALRY,  
WAR WITH SPAIN,  
March 22, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am at home in Dayton. Am very sorry to write to you upon this occasion, knowing that you are a very busy man.

I have a serious complaint to make against the management of the Soldiers' Home at Dayton. I was obliged to get out of there, although an invalid myself, on account of a man in the last stages of consumption being placed in a bed beside me, with only space for a chair between our beds and his cuspidor, which he continually coughed and spit in, set under my nose. I have respect and sympathy for a man in this condition, but there is a tuberculosis hospital here with several hundred empty beds, and this man from the mountains of Tennessee showed no respect for others to intrude himself in such a condition on the other members. His looks showed the ravages of the disease and his coughing all night and gasping for breath showed how near he was gone. He was also insanitary in his habits; for 10 days he did not wash out his cuspidor and spit all over the floor and bedclothing. In fact, he was in no condition to take care of himself, but did not want to go to the hospital.

I reported this to Ben Atkinson, the adjutant, as being detrimental to the health of others in the closely crowded unventilated room with the heads of the beds together in the center row, necessitating the breathing of one another's breath, and only room for a chair between the beds in the rows, as well as the annoyance of his coughing all night. He occupied a bed just across the aisle from me at the time I made the complaint, but a few days later a man next to me on the same side went out and this man with consumption was moved over in the bed next to me, obviously in defiance of the complaint I had made.

I refused to sleep beside the man and asked for my discharge. The captain told me he would have it for me the next day. I told him that I was going immediately (1 p. m.), that I would not wait for my discharge and would not sleep beside this sick man. So I demanded my belongings and called for a cab, with the understanding that my discharge would be sent to me. Two hours after I left the home this consumptive was in the tuberculosis hospital. He was in barracks, Company 3, two weeks and they refused to take notice of this until after they had got rid of me. Then he was given a note to go to the general hospital, and when he got there he was held. He was taken back to the barracks in an ambulance in care of both a doctor and a nurse, and from there to the tuberculosis hospital. They usually send a wardman with a patient of this kind, but in this instance they made a grandstand play, knowing by putting me out of the home that I would make a complaint, and they wanted to counteract the story.

There were many others that had made a complaint to the captain about this man, but the captain told them that they were no doctor and that he was running the company and them that did not like it to get out. In this case, the blame falls directly on the captain, H. L. Arney; Ben Atkinson, the adjutant, which I informed several days before; and Major Roberts, the chief surgeon. This consumptive was either put in this barracks to drive out decent, sober members, or spreading the disease to fill up the empty beds in the tuberculosis hospital. There was also another man in the last stages of asthma and bronchial trouble who coughed all night and annoyed the other members and should have been in the hospital.

The bed which I occupied was filthy with oil and grease where a previous member affected with a skin disease had slept and used oil and ointment on his body as a cure for his disease, and the oil had soaked through the sheets on the tick. Many complaints were made against this man using the same bath tub that the other members had to use. No notice was taken to this. The blankets were also filthy dirty, but if you complain about anything like this they put you through the torture process until you have to get out. I have been informed that the bed and blankets which this tuberculosis patient used, Company 3, bed 42, were not fumigated or changed but left for the next man to use.

This outward showing of sanitary regulations around these homes is a farce. I was vaccinated five times in the last four years against my will; all together I was vaccinated about fifteen times, with a large original scar on my arm, while some of the Regulars, with their name on the

pay roll for the last 20 years, have never been vaccinated at all. The closed overheated, overcrowded rooms with the windows kept closed, the inhaling of other breaths, some with consumption, catarrh, asthma, all kinds of liniments, sore legs, drunken breaths, unsanitary persons, old pipes, and smoking cigarettes all night can not help but spread disease. It looks like it is managed this way to create sickness and fill up the hospitals. They get twice as much for taking care of hospital patients as other members and feed them less. I was nearly starved to death when I was in the hospital four years ago. About 60 per cent of the hospital patients do not need any treatment, but are kept there for pigeon stools, spies, and to fill up the beds, create jobs for the doctors and nurses, while many hospital cases are left in the barracks to create diseases among the others.

I was not ready to leave the home at the time I was forced out. I have been an invalid for five years, but my ailment is not contagious nor loathsome. I have sciatica and neuralgia and subject to nervous breakdowns, was sunstroke twice in the Army, and am now in my sixty-second year. I was sick for five days in the Ohio Hotel after I left the home on account of the way I was driven out. When I went to the home in December I asked to go to the convalescent barracks, but Ben Atkinson, the adjutant, ordered me sent to Company 10 (assuming a physician's authority).

The barracks were filled up with such drunken fellows that insulted and molested the others that I asked to be transferred. A few days after a man was murdered in Company 10 during a drunken brawl. Last summer a man was murdered in the mess hall at Danville. The way the officials manage these homes creates this hatred among the members. No complaints are allowed to be made. When a member dares to make a complaint he is marked a victim to be forced out through the torture process, and his pedigree follows him to the other homes. This is the result of a masked tyranny which certain members have got to endure.

I was transferred to Company 3. This captain that put the tuberculosis patient next to me had just took charge. The other captain was down in jail in Dayton, arrested with whisky in his automobile. The jail records will show this. He had been on a drunk for a week running the barracks. They are most all like this. It would be interesting for an investigating committee to examine the jail and workhouse records where these homes are located and compare these names with the names on the pay roll of the soldiers' home. Company 3 was the most drunken barracks that I was ever in. Drunken orgies were indulged in all night. The toilet room was used for straining canned heat and drinking bay rum. Sometimes there were as much as two buckets full of empty whisky bottles carried out in the morning. One man, while I was there, was carried in drunk twice in one day and put to bed. He and several others were drunk for three weeks at a time and always a dozen or more were drunk and up at all times at night, cursing, raving, and keeping the others awake. These appeared to be the captain's best friends and the only eligible members to the home. There is no pretense of living by the rules of the home any more. The depraved element which the officials are inclined to favor have got beyond control and the barracks are nothing more than madhouses.

When a petition was passed around some time ago for the members to sign favoring the retention of the present Board of Managers as heads of the homes I refused to sign it. Others signed it because they were afraid they would be put out of the homes if they refused. I feel that I exercised my constitutional rights when I refused to sign this petition for the present Board of Managers to continue in charge of the homes. I felt that a change would be better for the welfare of the members. I have been tortured, insulted, starved, mistreated, and forced to get out of these homes every time I have ever been in one of them, and this is true of many other decent, intelligent, and deserving men that the officials do not want around where they can see too much.

These men of polished learning and political power with great donations in their hands to be spent for the benefit of disabled and old, aged veterans of wars are money mad and elated over their long time in public service. They have forgotten the needs of those they represent; they have set up a machine of masked tyranny against these victims that are in need of mercy. It is with ten times more fervency that I appeal for justice in behalf of those who are in a worse condition than myself, who are without learning and the gift of self-perseverance, but whose hearts were in the right place when the country was in need of their service. They are now forced out of these homes that the good people of the country provided for them.

I would now kindly ask that this information be put into the hands of the proper authorities with a view of a complete change being made in the personnel of these military homes so that honorable, intelligent men who volunteered their service for their country and who bore the brunt of the battles in time of war and in time of peace went back in the channels of industry to do their part in life, who now on account of their age and infirmities need the aid of these institutions can live there in peace, and that these homes be used for the purpose which they were intended for, or else closed up and the worthy and unfortunate be given a pension sufficient to live upon.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS EAGLIN.



CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1930.

Gen. GEORGE H. WOOD,  
President Board of Managers, National Military Home,  
Dayton, Ohio.

DEAR GENERAL: I am inclosing copy of a letter which I have just received from Thomas Eaglin, 22 Clay Street, Dayton, Ohio, a veteran of the Spanish War, telling of revolting and loathsome conditions at the soldiers' home.

I would be very happy if you would have these charges carefully investigated with particular reference to the different items I have marked from 1 to 14 and let me know.

1. If Thomas Eaglin reported to the adjutant the intolerable proximity of the man suffering from consumption.

2. If, after this report, this consumptive was moved in the bed next to Eaglin.

3. If this consumptive within two hours after Eaglin left the home was removed from barracks 3 to the tuberculosis hospital.

4. If there was another man in barracks 3 disturbing others in the night with coughing and the sufferings of asthma, etc.

5. If the bed assigned to Eaglin was foul with oil or grease, or had been slept in by one with skin disease before his occupancy.

6. If complaints have been made about this man using the bathtub with other members and no notice taken.

7. If the blankets furnished to Eaglin were "filthy dirty."

8. If there was no special cleaning or fumigation of bed clothing used by the tubercular patients in bed 42 of Company 3.

9. If these barracks are habitually overheated, kept with windows closed at night with diseased and unsanitary condition of members.

10. If there are any large number, such as 60 per cent, of the hospital patients who should be in barracks and men with contagious and other troublesome diseases in the barracks who might receive beneficial treatment in the hospital.

11. If a man was recently killed in Company 10 during a drunken brawl.

12. If during last summer a man was killed in the mess hall at Danville.

13. If the former captain of Company 3 was in jail in Dayton for a violation of the prohibition act.

14. If drunken orgies are indulged in in company barracks during the nighttime with toilet rooms for "straining canned heat and drinking bay rum."

I would be very pleased if you would have these matters gone into with impartial care with the idea of discovering the true conditions and seeing what may be done for their improvement.

Very truly yours,

ROY G. FITZGERALD.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,  
HEADQUARTERS NATIONAL MILITARY HOME,  
Dayton, Ohio, April 3, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.  
Subject: Complaint of Thomas Eaglin relative to conditions Central Branch, Dayton, Ohio.

MY DEAR ROY: Your letter of recent date inclosing letter from Thomas Eaglin received. As I stated the other day, I turned it over to Col. B. K. Cash for his personal investigation.

The man complained of by Eaglin as suffering from tuberculosis is named Sherrer. He has been in and out of the various branch homes since 1911, and the diagnosis made up to the present time has been general disabilities not connected with his lungs. On his last readmission to the Central Branch, diagnosis of chronic bronchitis was made, in addition to other disabilities. As soon as the complaint in regard to his coughing disturbing members reached the adjutant's office, the adjutant referred him to the surgeon for examination. He was placed in the tuberculosis hospital for observation and after two weeks' observation a tentative diagnosis of chronic pulmonary tuberculosis, military, has been made. Considerable doubt still remains in the minds of the doctors due to the fact that 10 negative sputa were obtained, and there is also a question as to his former occupation which was that of a coal miner, entering into this case to a considerable extent, but the important fact involved is that as soon as the matter was brought to the attention of the adjutant the transfer and observation was made. I might add that the case is so unique that it is being placed before the Montgomery County Clinical Association, meeting to be held next Friday night.

In regard to changing beds, the condition in the home, as you know, for the past few months has been such that we have been crowded to the limit in caring for our members, and frequent changes of beds have been made to meet this demand.

In regard to there being an asthmatic in Company 2 disturbing members, we can not find there was such a man.

In regard to the bed furnished Eaglin, there was a stain on the underside of the mattress, but the bed linen, etc., furnished was fresh

and clean from the laundry when the bed was assigned to him. I might add that the man referred to by Eaglin as suffering from skin disease has been ordered into the hospital for treatment.

As far as the condition of blankets is concerned, our general orders are that the blankets are to be kept clean, and if any of them are not clean they are sent to the laundry for washing.

The company commander does not remember any complaints being made to him nor were any complaints made to the inspector about the use of the bathtubs. There are shower baths on each floor of this building in addition to the tubs which can be used by the members.

It has been the custom at all branches where a case of this kind develops to have the mattress, blankets, etc., thoroughly fumigated. In this instance the company commander was a new man and overlooked it, but he has been admonished as to his duties in the future.

The question of ventilation of barracks has been a question which I have been in personal contact with for 16 years, and to suit the individual wishes of the members is practically an impossibility. In the most recent barracks built at the Pacific Branch an attempt is being made to obviate this trouble by the use of a small ward room where men of the same tastes can be quartered together, but in a building like No. 3 referred to, in which one ward covers an entire floor, it is impossible.

The hospitals at other branches have been so full this last two or three winters with men acutely sick that at times we have been obliged to turn away men in need of treatment because we had no beds to spare and it is possible that many men in barracks would be better off in the hospital if we had beds for them.

Several months ago some men were in the upper story of 10 who had been drinking, and the company commander came up to this floor to look into the matter, and one of the members, apparently without provocation, jumped off his bunk and struck another member with his fist on the head, causing his death. The case was turned over to the coroner, and is now being handled by the civil authorities of Montgomery County.

Last summer, apparently without any provocation whatsoever, a Spanish War veteran shot and seriously wounded a comrade in the mess hall at Danville during the dinner hour. There had been no ill will between the men and apparently no altercation before the shooting took place. It was done right across the table. This case was also turned over to the civil authorities of Vermillion County, Ill.

The man who was captain of Company 3 before Eaglin became a member of that company was arrested by the civil authorities off the home grounds and the case was handled by the civil authorities.

As far as drinking or drunken revelries in barracks are concerned, all officers of the home are under the strictest orders and do make an honest effort to put a stop to this. The situation which we are facing is a difficult one, but I can assure you that the home authorities are making every effort in the world to carry out the general policy of the Government in regard to possession or use of liquor.

I want to thank you for calling my attention to this case, because there are in it several lapses which we are taking steps to prevent in the future and unless we are given the benefit of criticism we can not improve our service.

I am inclosing herewith copy of office letter of April 2, 1930, to all governors relative to members suffering with skin disease or pulmonary tuberculosis, active.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE H. WOOD.

[Copy inclosed with letter from Gen. George H. Wood of April 3, 1930]  
APRIL 2, 1930.

THE GOVERNOR, ALL BRANCHES:

Members suffering with skin disease, or pulmonary tuberculosis, active.

1. It has come to the attention of these headquarters that in certain instances members of the home afflicted with skin disease, when the cases are noncontagious, have been allowed to remain in barrack. While these cases are noncontagious, they are obnoxious from the standpoint of the other members of the barrack. To date from the receipt of this letter all cases of skin disease, whether acute or chronic, coming under the above caption, will be transferred to hospital where they can be properly cared for and treated; and the allowing of this type of case to remain in barrack will be strictly prohibited.

2. Great care must be exercised in order that members suffering with pulmonary tuberculosis, active, are not allowed to remain in barrack. Occasionally a case of active tuberculosis has been discovered after the member has been on a domiciliary status for a considerable period of time. The above is a situation which must be carefully watched by the medical staff, especially upon original examination and at sick call; and any members showing a suspicious symptomatology along the lines indicated will be immediately given a thorough examination and period of observation if necessary, in order to establish an accurate diagnosis.

3. When any of the above cases are removed to the hospital from barrack, the bed will be thoroughly cleaned, mattress sterilized, blankets washed, and clean linen throughout provided before a new member is assigned to the bed.

4. The above matters will be brought by the surgeon to the personal attention of all members of the medical staff, and new staff members will be properly instructed.

5. Receipt of this letter will be acknowledged.

CHIEF SURGEON.

APRIL 12, 1930.

HON. ROY G. FITZGERALD,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I received a copy of the letter you wrote General Wood, April 7, in receipt of the acknowledgment of the investigation caused by the complaint I made in regards to the tubercular patient that was put in the bed next to me in barracks 3. I also note in your letter that you took notice to the evasive answer they made in regards to the contempt the adjutant or captain showed in placing this sick man in a bed next to me after the adjutant was notified of the sick man's condition.

I want to thank you very much for all the sincere interest you have taken in this case, and am sensitive of the fact that it will be due to your prompt service, moral courage, and devotion to a cause that is just that many of the unfortunate members of the home will hereafter receive better treatment, although I may be used for a "goat" and martyr for the benefit of others; I am also conscious of that!

It will not be necessary for you to answer this letter, as I am willing to let the case drop where it is for this time and do not wish to take any more of your time, as I realize the many other important affairs that consume your time. Yet for your information I would like to comment on a few phrases of General Wood's letter to you on the case. The general says he turned it over to Col. B. K. Cash; in such cases the adjutant, Ben Adkinson, and the chief surgeon, Major Roberts, would be called on to furnish a report. These fellows have acquired their positions and intrenched themselves in the confidence of the Board of Managers for their skill in making alibis for such complaints. The letter states:

"As soon as the complaint in regards to this man's coughing reached the adjutant's office, the adjutant referred him to the surgeon for examination."

It was five days after I made this complaint to the adjutant, Ben Adkinson, that this sick man was moved over in the bed next to me. I will make an affidavit to that effect. There was no attention given to this complaint that I made to the adjutant during these five days until after I left the home. Then, as soon as I was gone, the captain handed him a note to report at the hospital, and in less than two hours after I left the home he was placed in the tuberculosis hospital. Members of the home have since told me his case at the time was pronounced permanent and he would not be allowed to leave the tuberculosis hospital. If this could have been done in two hours after I left, how is it that five days elapsed after I complained to the adjutant and nothing was done?

"He was placed in the tuberculosis hospital for observation \* \* \*. Considerable doubt still remains in the minds of the doctors, due to the fact that he was a former coal miner."

What does coal mining, any more than cigar making have to do to a man's disease? A man with good sense did not have to be a doctor to tell that this man was in the last stages of consumption, his skeleton-like looks and consumptive cough told the story. When he came in with a small grip in his hand he was all in, he was breathing heavy and had to sit down and rest before he could go any longer. He came direct to this bed across from me; there were other empty beds in the barracks. That was two weeks before I left the home.

A man that was next to me went out on the 12th of March, and he (this sick man) was then moved over next to me. This was five days after I had made the complaint to the adjutant, and presuming in defiance of the complaint I had made. The letter stated that he had been in and out of the home since 1911. This showed that he was an old-timer and knew by giving the captain a tip he could get by with it. When they go before the doctors for readmission, in most cases the doctor just asks their disability and writes it down as given. This accounts for him getting by the doctors, and some of these are young and inexperienced.

"In regard to the bed furnished Eaglin: There was a stain on the underside of the mattress, but the bed linen, etc., furnished was fresh and clean from the laundry when the bed was assigned to him."

The bed was not assigned to me. I asked to move over there to get away from the drunks in the end where I had been and to get some fresh air. After the man with the skin disease left this bed, another member named De Haven was put in the bed; later on he was taken to the hospital dangerously ill from drinking bay rum. I moved into the bed the same day De Haven was taken to the hospital; he had been on a drunk for several days; no clean linen nor blankets, either, were given me; these are only issued on certain days in the week, except when a new man comes in. I took the linen and pillows of the other

bed which I had been using and these that were on the bed I put back on the bed which I had previously occupied. I was afraid to exchange the blankets, for if I had been caught doing it I would have been reprimanded by the sergeant or captain, unless I had slipped them a piece of money. I am opposed to tipping these drunken captains and sergeants when they are being paid to do this work. The dirtiest, filthiest looking blanket I secretly exchanged for another on an empty bed. Sherrer, the sick man, afterwards took this bed.

There is no top and bottom to these ticks, they are required to be turned over from time to time and this tick was grease and oil at both sides and all over, and I venture to say it is not on that bed now. Their alibis are a part of the perfected system under which these homes at the present time are dominated. This captain of Company 3 has placed himself in a position for promotion.

"The letter admits that the blankets and bed used by the consumptive patient were not fumigated. The alibi was that the captain was a new man."

There are enough things admitted, with what the records will show, to substantiate all that I have said. This captain, H. L. Arney, had previously been a sergeant in Company 8, and it is the sergeant's duty to see that beds are fumigated and kept clean, and it was due to his experience as acting captain that he was considered by the officials as competent for a company commander. He knew enough to take the money. The last time I saw him he was taking a dollar from a new man coming in. That secured this new man home protection. A man that never had a job outside is a good qualification for a captain in a soldiers' home under the present management.

In regards to the killing scrapes the answers are about as palatable as those I have commented on. General Wood would have you believe they were only sociable, friendly, killings. The letter said: "There were no ill feelings between the men and apparently no altercation before the shooting. A Spanish-American veteran seriously wounded a comrade." I was in Chicago at the time and later in Danville at the time the case came up for trial. The Danville newspapers then said there had been a heated quarrel over a seat at the table in the mess hall. The man then held in jail charged with murder went back to the barracks and got a gun (which he had for protection in the home) and went back to the mess hall and killed the other man. The case was postponed on account of smallpox at the home. I talked to some of the members that were loafing about the streets of Danville at the time and they said there was no smallpox out there.

"And the case was turned over to Col. B. K. Cash to investigate."

I presume this was the same Inspector Cash whose brother-in-law, Owen Green, a former State senator of Indiana, died in the bed next to me with the "flu" and pneumonia at Danville in February, 1926. Mr. Cash, who I think came there with him, remained at the home waiting developments, and was called to his bedside when he died. This patient was a Civil War veteran; he got better and was up once; and I believe if he had been properly taken care of he would have got over that case of influenza. On the next side to me at this time was a bed patient, Kilgore by name, that should have been kept in a room to himself. He was a Civil War veteran, was paralyzed, and affected with a skin disease and treated for this daily by the ward man; when his bed was made up the covers were always laid over on my bed. The next man put in the bed on the other side where Mr. Green died was another "flu" case; his name was William Craig, a Civil War veteran, born and raised on the ground where the Danville Home now stands. I knew this Craig for several years, met him there when he came back from California, and we were good friends. He owned property in Los Angeles and was one of the leaders that caused the senatorial investigation at the Pacific Branch in 1916. He is a sober, intelligent, and well-preserved man, not afraid to talk, and you can rely on him for information.

"This case is so unique that it is being placed before the Montgomery County Clinical Association."

That is a joke. The only thing that I can see unique about this tuberculosis patient was that officials running this home put him in a barracks among other men, either to spread the disease or to drive others out. The man can not live long and they can examine him all they want to. However, in the event that this case should ever come up again, Major Roberts is tricky enough, with the aid of some of his friends at this banquet given by his hospitality at the Government's expense last night, to prepare a plausible alibi. He has had 18 years' experience in making alibis.

"The most important fact involved is that, as soon as the matter was brought to the attention of the adjutant, the transfer and observation was made."

After two weeks of complaining to the captain, by other members, and five days after I had gone to the adjutant, he was sent to the tuberculosis hospital. But the most important thing was that this was not done until after he was moved over in the bed next to me and I had left the home. It appears that the object had been accomplished. Still more important in this case is that General Wood in his letter is silent on the most vital points at issue, the discrimination against me by putting the sick man in a bed next to me after I had complained to the adjutant. The argument is all in defense of the



incompetency of management and violation of the rules of the home on their part. Nothing is said of me going to the adjutant nor leaving the home because there was no action taken in the case while I was there. They all seem to be perfectly satisfied that I was forced out of the home and that that is entirely proper. That part of the home management speaks for itself.

Now, it would not be safe, or very pleasant at least, for me to go out there again after this complaint I have made and the investigation(?) that was made. They tell the public that they invite complaints but they offer no protection for the sober deserving member that is forced out and afraid of his life to make a complaint when tortured by the pigeon stools they keep on the pay roll. This is a part of the perfected system to keep unfortunate members' mouths closed even after they are drove out.

I would also be afraid to be vaccinated again in one of these homes, for there is no telling what might be on the point of these needles. This is where they will get me next time should I ever apply for admission again, for I will certainly refuse to be vaccinated, and there is pretty sure to be some vaccinating going on after this big reception given out at the home last night by Major Roberts. I was vaccinated twice in two weeks last February, all together about fifteen times in the homes—I think this is enough. I have a large scar on my arm from where I was vaccinated when a boy. This will be an excuse for them to bar me from the homes in the future, but it will not be without a long and hard fight if I am able to stand on my feet. Thanking you for all of your favors, I am,

Very respectfully,

THOMAS EAGLIN.

I add a letter from a loyal welfare worker, which adds another picture of how our veterans are preyed upon.

DAYTON, OHIO, March 5, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: You may not remember me, but of course I have met you a number of times in Dayton.

For 12 years I have been doing some welfare work in the Montgomery County Jail and have had a great deal of experience with prisoners.

I am wondering whether you are aware of conditions existing at the border line of the National Military Home. At pension time the inmates of the home, especially the young men, are constantly watched by the constables, and they are arrested and brought into the jail when they are guilty of nothing more than congregating together. If one or two have been drinking, the entire crowd is taken in. Many of them are not in a condition to be away from the home at all, as there are many crippled and others are very ill and under special treatment at the home. Sometimes as many as 12 are brought in at one time.

Is there not something that can be done in this situation? Can not these constables be prevented from making wholesale arrests? They are charged with drinking when it is very apparent that some of them have not been doing so. The squire fines them and the fine and costs amount anywhere from \$25 to \$40. If this is not paid they must stay in jail at the rate of \$1.50 per day.

I decided to call this matter to your attention and to ask you if there is anything you can do to relieve the situation.

Thanking you, I am sincerely yours,

SARA I. WHITESIDE.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) When the consolidation and coordination herein provided for shall have been effected in the administration of veterans' affairs the President shall so declare by proclamation or order, whereupon the corporation known as the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and the Board of Managers shall cease to exist.

(b) All contracts and other valid and subsisting obligations of the corporation, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, shall continue and be and become obligations of the United States, and the United States shall be considered as substituted for said corporation with respect to all such demands either by or against said corporation, unless and until they shall thereafter be superseded or discharged according to law. The outstanding obligations assumed by the United States by virtue of the provisions of this subdivision may be enforced in the Court of Claims or in the district courts of the United States according to the ordinary provisions of law governing actions against the United States, and such courts shall have the power to enter judgment against the United States, with interest, in the same manner and to the same extent that said corporation may now be sued. No such suit shall be maintained upon any cause of action existing at the time of the dissolution of said corporation or arising simultaneously therewith, unless brought within two years from the time of such dissolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 16, after the word "enforced," insert the words "by suit."

Page 5, line 21, strike out the word "that" and insert the words "as if."

Page 5, line 22, strike out the words "may now be sued" and insert "were party defendant."

The committee amendments were severally read and severally agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) All unexpended appropriations in respect of any hospital, bureau, agency, office, or home consolidated into the administration of veterans' affairs shall, upon such consolidation, become available for expenditure by the administration of veterans' affairs and shall be treated as if the administration of veterans' affairs had been originally named in the laws making the appropriations.

(b) All orders, rules, regulations, and permits or other privileges, issued or granted in respect of any function consolidated under the provisions of this act and in effect at the time of the consolidation, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed by the administrator of veterans' affairs.

(c) The administrator of veterans' affairs shall make annually, at the close of each fiscal year, a report in writing to the Congress, giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and his administration, describing the work done, and stating his activities under subdivision (b) of section 1 of this act, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the active performance of the duties and purposes of his administration.

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: Page 6, line 24, after the word "administration," strike out the period and insert "and shall submit to the Congress at its next session, beginning December, 1930, a study or report as to the feasibility of transferring to the central office at Washington, D. C., all administrative functions, such as the collection of insurance premiums, making payments of compensation, and all clerical functions pertaining thereto now being performed by the several regional offices, together with a statement showing what, if any, saving in administrative costs would be accomplished thereby, together with what, if any, disadvantages would be suffered by the veterans: *Provided*, That pending such report by the administrator and the consolidation and coordination herein provided for, no further decentralization of functions now performed in the central office of the United States Veterans' Bureau at Washington, D. C., shall be made to the regional offices."

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I have given considerable thought and study to the question of cost in administration of the laws enacted for the veterans of all wars, and I believe that the bill now before us will go a long way in bringing about a more economical administration as well as increasing the material benefits of the disabled veterans, and I am thoroughly in accord with any program which tends to lessen the burden of taxation, provided that the program does not result in a detriment to the disabled veteran, and to the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice on the altar of the war god. I shall endeavor to explain, and briefly so, why I believe my amendment will not only depreciate the cost of administration, but will be advantageous to the veteran.

The bill now before us provides for an annual saving of approximately two and one-half million dollars, while the amendment which I offer for your consideration will show an annual saving of some five million dollars on two items of administration in the Veterans' Bureau which are chargeable to the expenditures allocated to the regional offices. The two items mentioned in my amendment are the collection of insurance premiums which should be collected by the central office direct, and thereby eliminate the duplication of records and accounting. The second item relates to the veterans who are drawing compensation on a permanent basis; that is, their disabilities have reached a fixed status, and according to the testimony of General Hines, accompanying H. R. 10630 on the consolidation of veterans' activities, 70 per cent or more of the World War veterans who are drawing compensation are on a permanent basis, which means that all there is to do in these cases is to mail the veterans their monthly checks. This check requires a check in the regional office, a check in the central office, and a further check by the Comptroller General's office. This procedure applies to the collection of insurance premiums as well. So, speaking in the parlance of the well-known radio comedians, we have a check and double check at an enormous overhead cost, which could and should be eliminated, thereby effecting an annual saving of some five million dollars.

We all concur, I am sure, in the fact that the decentralization of administrative functions of any business or organization is indeed expensive and not at all satisfactory. Relating to the Veterans' Bureau, I would class as administrative the functions of rating, adjudication, payment of compensation, and the collection of insurance premiums and the auditing thereof. Such functions as examining, treatment, and social care of our veterans are not administrative in character and should be performed in as close proximity to the veteran as possible. However, my amendment only deals with two items and the auditing thereof of the functions which I class administrative. Regardless of the fact that whether Congress passes this bill providing for the consolidation of veteran activities, why should not the Veterans' Bureau transfer cases which have reached a permanent status to the central office and mail checks therefrom?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Since many of us did not hear your amendment when it was read, will you kindly restate its purport?

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. I will be glad to say that it provides for a study by the administrator of functions now being performed in the regional offices, such as the collection of insurance funds and the payment of compensation. I shall try to bring it out more clearly.

The passage of the Johnson or I believe what is now named the Rankin bill will increase the activities of the various regional offices; and in order to expedite the thousands of claims which will necessarily follow, why not transfer to the central office all activities such as my amendment suggests? For my amendment, which I submit for your consideration, does not in the least involve the taking away of any benefits now inuring to the disabled veterans and does not affect the bill in any way. It only provides that we shall not incur any further administrative expense during this year for decentralization, and by having the administrator report to Congress, we will have the benefit of his valuable knowledge and experience of administration, which can be given consideration by Congress in its general study of veterans' legislation; and then if my conclusions be true, I would like to see this annual saving of some five million dollars diverted in a channel which would benefit the veteran. This saving could be used in improving our hospitals along the lines suggested by General Hines before the Appropriations Committee, that is by equipping each of our hospitals in such a manner that no matter what disease or injury a veteran might be suffering from, he can receive proper treatment therein. As it is to-day, our disabled men must travel hundreds of miles to receive treatment for a particular disability, although we have one or more hospitals in nearly every State.

I trust, ladies and gentlemen, that you will adopt my amendment, and thus we can ascertain the advisability of my suggestion.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is there any substantive law that forbids the transfer of these activities now to the central office?

Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky. None to my knowledge.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Why, then, is it necessary to offer an amendment for that to be done? The purpose of the bill is to reduce expenses, and it is fair to assume that all transfers in the interest of economy will be carried out. It occurs to me that an amendment like that would tend to destroy the faith which the supporters of the bill have in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been very much interested in the main question proposed by the pending bill, and I believe that much of the controversy has been occasioned by the confusion of terms. Those who have read the hearings will readily see that the distinction was never regarded—that "consolidation" and "coordination" are words used promiscuously and interchangeably and synonymously when they have distinct definite legal meanings. Now, consolidation means to merge. It means the abolishing of different entities and the merging of them into one new and independent bureau or agency. That is what consolidation means. On the other hand, coordination means bringing them together, and, as recommended by the special committee

and the President in his message, bringing them together under an assistant secretary of some department, under a member of the Cabinet.

Now, let us return to an investigation of what the experts say on the subject. I have due regard for every member of the committee here. The committee is composed of able men, who are prompted by an earnest and unquestioned desire to serve the veterans in the way of improvement of the service and to serve the country. But what do our expert witnesses say in regard to this question?

On the 23d day of May, 1929, the President appointed a committee consisting of the Secretary of the Interior as chairman; Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau; Gen. George H. Wood, president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; Hon. Walter H. Newton, then Member of Congress, now Secretary to the President; and Col. C. B. Hodges, military aide to the President, as executive secretary, which committee was to "consider the better coordination of Government activities dealing with veterans' matters." Under date of October 1, 1929, this committee made a unanimous preliminary report to the President containing the following recommendations:

(a) That the President should be given by Congress the power to bring under a common head all forces of the Government for veterans' relief so as to obtain better coordination and so that a uniform program can be developed for the future. (If the President should so desire, the committee will submit the draft of a bill to bring this about.) No effort to bring existing legislation into a uniform program is recommended.

(b) That the President take immediate steps for coordination, as follows:

(1) Create a central coordination committee composed of representatives from the Pension Bureau, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the Veterans' Bureau, to meet at periodic times in Washington.

Its functions should be to continue on a permanent basis the conferences initiated by this committee as a clearing house for data promoting avoidance of overlaps, joint utilization of medical and hospital facilities, interchange of up-to-date statistics on facilities available, avoidance of unnecessary transportation, etc.

(2) Create district coordination committees, similar to the central committee, but functioning at strategic field points.

Their local duties should be similar to those of the central committee. They should be charged with the responsibility for furnishing current data to the central committee upon facilities available and possibilities of coordination. Effective teamwork must be secured by practical and informal cooperation in the field before it can be effected by formal direction from Washington.

(c) That this committee be continued in existence to make a further study of the results achieved by the above-mentioned coordination committee within the trial period, say, of one year; and, if so desired by the President, to make further recommendation concerning the manner of bringing existing agencies for veterans' relief under a common head.

We all agree with the general statements made by the gentleman from New Jersey. But what did this special committee say? This is what they said:

That the President should be given by Congress the power to bring under a common head all forces of the Government for veterans' relief so as to obtain better—

Better what? Better coordination—not so as to obtain consolidation but—

better coordination, and so that a uniform program can be developed for the future.

That is what the special committee reported.

Then, on December 3, 1929, President Hoover embodied the recommendations of his special committee in his message to Congress, in which he said:

I am convinced that we will gain in efficiency, economy, and more uniform administration and better definition of national policies if the Pension Bureau, the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers, and the Veterans' Bureau are brought together under a single agency.

\* \* \* The conservation of national resources is spread among eight agencies in five departments. They suffer from conflict and overlap. There is no proper development and adherence to broad national policies and no central point where the searchlight of public opinion may concentrate itself. These functions should be grouped under the direction of some such official as an assistant secretary of conservation. The particular department or Cabinet officer under which such a group should be placed is of secondary importance to the need of concentration. The same may be said of educational services, of merchant marine aids, of public works, of public health, of veterans' services, and many others, the component parts of which are widely scattered in the various departments and independent agencies.



Does the pending bill embody the recommendations of the special committee appointed by President Hoover to investigate the subject? Does it embody the recommendations of the President in his message to Congress? Those questions must be answered in the negative.

The bill provides for consolidation instead of coordination. It transfers all the powers of the several agencies to one bureau designated as the "administration of veterans' affairs" whereas the report and message of the President recommended that they be grouped under an assistant secretary in a department under a Cabinet officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GARBER] is recognized for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. The President said:

I am convinced that we will gain in efficiency, economy, more uniform organization and better definition of national policies if the Pension Bureau, the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers and the Veterans' Bureau are brought together under a single agency.

Nowhere does the President recommend a consolidation of those agencies. As a member of the Cabinet under two presidents, as Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover heard the weekly discussions of the members regarding the work of their various bureaus and departments. As its Secretary he brought the Department of Commerce from obscurity into national and international fame for its efficiency. I believe the President is the best qualified person in the public service to speak upon this question and to advise the course to pursue. [Applause.]

The coordinating of the related agencies of the Government, the bringing of them together, cutting out the overlap and duplication, the elimination of waste and red tape is one of the big objectives of the administration. It is one of the big responsibilities voluntarily assumed by the Chief Executive. His suggestions are the result of long experience, study, and recognized ability. They are such as in my judgment should be approved and adopted by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Has the gentleman any reason to believe that the President is not in favor of this bill as written?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I am not indulging in speculations or beliefs of that kind at all.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say that the President has been fully consulted on this bill.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I am just presenting the evidence to the members of this committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it fair to assume that the Secretary of the Interior would come before the gentleman's committee and take a position opposed to that held by the President?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It is peculiar, but that is what he did.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, we will take that with a grain of salt.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Another witness testified before the committee, and that witness might inform the gentleman as to what the President believes. I do not undertake any such responsibility, but I believe the gentleman will agree with me that Secretary Wilbur, with his close association and relationship to the President, is entitled to consideration in expressing his belief. Secretary Wilbur stated as follows, referring to the President's belief:

In his message he stated he thought these organizations should be brought together under a common agency, and I infer, combining that with another statement in his message, that it would be under an assistant secretary, since it was all in the same field. I think you can read that into that message.

That is what the Secretary of the Interior, a close personal friend of the President, and whom he appointed chairman of the subcommittee to investigate this matter, says, in his judgment, is what the President believes.

Now, this is the responsibility of the two political parties. It is a peculiar responsibility resting upon the present administration. I stand for the enactment of a measure that will carry out the policy of the President in this respect. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman know of anyone who is closer to the President than the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I do not.

The Pension Bureau is one of the most efficient agencies we have in the public service. It was brought to this high state of efficiency under the direction of a Commissioner of Pensions in the Department of the Interior under a Cabinet officer. Col. Winfield Scott, a veteran of two wars and Commissioner of Pensions under the Coolidge administration, contributed much to its present high state of efficiency. His splendid service in that position, his sympathetic personal attention and liberal construction of the law is remembered with appreciation by every member of this committee. The present commissioner is maintaining that high state of efficiency attained under the Scott administration.

According to the last report, there were on the rolls of the Pension Bureau 477,000 pensioners and on the rolls of the Veterans' Bureau 349,806 beneficiaries. The proposed transfer of the power of the Pension Bureau to the new bureau to be created was never contemplated by the President in his message to Congress but simply the grouping of the three agencies under an assistant secretary in a department under a Cabinet officer. Under such a scheme an appeal would lie to the Secretary. The proposal to merge and consolidate under an independent bureau would result in the same status that we now have between the Veterans' Bureau and the President, and if it would result in the same service it would be anything but satisfactory to the beneficiaries of that relief which it is the liberal policy of this Government to extend.

Consolidation should come only after further experience and development. Consolidation should be brought about by slow growth and as rapidly as experience and development shows it can be done with safety to the service of the veterans. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take one minute with reference to the pending amendment. The bill provides that the administrator shall make a report to Congress at the opening of each regular session of the Congress. This amendment, as I understand it, directs him to make a study of the question of whether or not the regional offices should be discontinued, and also directs that during such study veterans' activities shall not be any further decentralized.

I think this report had better be left to the new administrator. Let him report upon the matters which he thinks should be reported upon. I do not think we should undertake in this bill to direct the administrator's attention to any particular part of the new set-up as to which he shall make a special study and report back to Congress. To a certain extent the proposed amendment would be a duplication of the work which is contemplated by the resolution which passed the House last week providing for a joint committee of Congress to make a complete study of veterans' legislation. That committee should make a study of that problem and report back to Congress, and we should not burden the new director with this additional work.

He will have enough to do to reorganize the activities and get them going without our putting this additional burden upon him. I therefore hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee some questions. I assume that the gentleman's study of this bill justified the positive statement which he is alleged to have made on yesterday on possible economies in administration. I refer to a speech which the gentleman made to some ladies' organization in Louisville; and I note at that time the gentleman stated in a very positive way that by effecting consolidations and coordinations we could safely look to a saving of many millions of dollars, and the gentleman estimated we could thereby dispense with the services of one-fourth the employees now on the pay rolls of the Government. Being a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was deeply interested in that statement, and I would like to have something definitely written into the RECORD which will serve as guide posts for the Committee on Appropriations when it comes to providing appropriations for the agencies that are to enjoy the benefits resulting from such mergers and consolidations. May I ask how much of that saving it is estimated will be reflected by the passage of this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Of course, it is impossible in advance to determine exactly what the saving will be. It has been estimated by witnesses who appeared before our committee that the total saving in administration expenses will in the end amount to approximately \$1,500,000 annually.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Resulting from the passage of this bill alone?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Resulting from this particular consolidation. It has also been estimated that there will be a saving made in the course of 8 or 10 years in the matter of construction, by making additions to institutions that we now have, in place of building new ones as we would have to do if they were to remain separate entities, amounting to eight or nine million dollars.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is the gentleman prepared to give a split up of that saving, so as to indicate the large items where savings will be reflected? For instance, I am specially interested to know how many employees we can safely count on dispensing with after the passage of this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think we can safely depend upon the reduction of personnel at all in the beginning.

It is going to take some time to get the consolidated activities reorganized. Eventually, I think, it will result in eliminating the regional offices and consolidating all the activities here in Washington, which will make possible a very large reduction in personnel, running better than 25 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have asked for a copy of the gentleman's speech made on yesterday, because I want to see how definite he was as to the savings to be effected, and I am wondering whether in that speech the gentleman gave only a general statement of the promised savings that will result from consolidations and coordinations.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I will say to the gentleman that I stated that in the event that we could organize the Government and run it as big business is being operated to-day we could cut down the personnel by 25 per cent. But I went on to state that as the Government is at present organized it could not be done.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Did the gentleman illustrate the position he then took by referring to this bill as a step in that direction?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think I did.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Did the gentleman have in mind this bill as being at least one of the steps by which we might accomplish that very desirable purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I had in mind this bill as one of the factors.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Did the gentleman have in mind that this bill would accomplish the definite savings promised the ladies, and that we would be able to materially cut down the personnel—and, after all, it is the personnel that costs, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If we get the right kind of an administrator, in my judgment we can cut the personnel within two years very close to 25 per cent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have asked for this time for the purpose of inviting your attention to one particular clause in the bill now under consideration. It is a part of section 2, the last three lines of the section, on page 3, lines 11, 12, and 13.

All final decisions or orders of any division, bureau, or board in the administration of veterans' affairs shall be subject to review, on appeal, by such administrator.

As I understand the present law, we start with a veteran's case at the regional office; after a hearing there and a decision that is unfavorable, we appeal the case to the central office. In my part of the country we appeal the case to New Orleans. From there the case is appealed to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau in Washington. If this bill becomes a law it provides for an additional appeal. There will not only be an appeal to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, but after the Director of the Veterans' Bureau passes on a case it can be appealed to the administrator. I do not object to any appeal if it is calculated to bring relief to the veterans, but I see no reason why we should have so many appeals. Justice should be administered without so many appeals and without so much delay.

As a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hearings on the bill which recently passed the House, and I noticed the testimony of one of the witnesses, that the cost of the appeals in these cases amounts to \$200 per case. It costs that much money to appeal a case from the regional office to the director here in Washington. If it costs \$200 to appeal one of these cases under the present law it will doubtless cost at least \$50 more in order to appeal a case to this new administrator. In many instances these files are 2 and 3 feet high. A witness testifying for the director told us that when an appeal is made it is necessary for a new group to take that whole file and carefully go through it. They are paying the people who are doing that work from \$3,000 to \$8,000 a year. Consequently it costs a great deal of money, and if we add this additional appeal it will

cost at least \$50 and possibly \$100 additional to appeal these cases.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman must remember that there are about 24,000 employees in the Veterans' Bureau and we have to provide something for them to do.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the reason I oppose this bill. If the present Johnson bill as amended in the House passes the Senate and becomes a law we can abolish a large number of the Veterans' Bureau positions. In fact, it will result in the discharge of thousands of employees in the Veterans' Bureau. There will be no necessity for keeping them on the pay roll. I predict that if the Johnson bill becomes a law it will save \$12,500,000 in administrative expenses; it will save millions of dollars in hospitalization, because soldiers who now go to the hospitals will not go there if they are permitted to draw a reasonable amount of compensation. I think there will be a saving to the Government in administrative and hospital expenses of at least \$25,000,000 if the Johnson bill is passed.

I know the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has worked faithfully for the veterans of the World War. She has said the Johnson bill has no chance of meeting with the approval of the President of the United States. With all due respect for her, I believe it has. That bill is nothing more than a bill to eliminate red tape from the administration of the World War veterans' act and to carry out the original intent of Congress. That is all that bill does. It is not as broad in its terms as a great many people would think. It will not cost the enormous sum of money to administer the law as is claimed by a large number of people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. All laws relating to the Bureau of Pensions, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the United States Veterans' Bureau, and other governmental bureaus, agencies, offices, and activities herein authorized and directed to be consolidated, so far as the same are applicable, shall remain in full force and effect, except as herein modified, and shall be administered by the administrator of veterans' affairs, except that section 4835 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Notice has been given by the gentleman from New York, who, being a veteran, has influence in this House in veterans' legislation and other matters, that he intends to demand a separate vote in the House on the amendment striking out subdivision (b) of section 1.

I think in fairness to the House I should say that after the first day of consideration of the bill for amendment, when subdivision (b) of section 1 was stricken out, the members of the Committee on Expenditures held a conference, went over the complete bill, and I think I can say that they unanimously agreed—certainly it was unanimous as to all those who were present, and most of the members of the committee were present—that the bill without subdivision (b)—

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman is now taking up matters that occurred in an executive session of the committee. I think we can legislate for ourselves here without any gentleman's agreement or any other kind of deal made in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. SWING. I can make my idea clear without revealing any secrets. I am safe in saying that it is the present opinion of the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, if not of all the members of the committee, that the bill with subdivision (b) of section 1 out presents a good, workable bill and that under section 2 the administrator will have all necessary power to eliminate duplication and waste, and to bring about the highest form of efficiency and the greatest economy at one and the same time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments where the action



was taken that the gentleman was endeavoring to relate to the House, was not an executive session of the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That makes no difference.

Mr. SWING. I will not refer again to anything that the committee did.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has already told us.

Mr. SWING. I think the opinion of practically every member of the committee as to the condition of the bill with subdivision (b) out is entitled to some weight by the House.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope if this bill should be passed by the House and enacted into law it will not disappoint the expectations of those who are sponsoring it. I hope it may result in the savings which they anticipate and in an increase of efficiency; but I would like to suggest very respectfully to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that there are many other directions in which the committee is empowered to look with respect to the matter of economy and efficiency.

When I came to the House there were 11 small committees charged with the duty of investigating expenditures in the various departments. After awhile I made the suggestion that, inasmuch as those committees did not function, they should be combined into a single committee charged with the duty of keeping in touch with all of the departments and agencies of the Government, with a view of preventing irregularities and effecting such savings as might be possible.

In 1927, at the beginning of the Seventieth Congress, under the leadership of our respected friend the late Martin Madden, the suggestion was carried into effect, and this committee was created, of which the able gentleman who faces me is the chairman.

Now, see how extensive is the power vested in the committee. It is to make "examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments and commissions of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers"; and so on.

So far as I know, and I am not saying this critically but regretfully, the committee which has been in existence since December, 1927, has brought before the House only two bills, the bill we are now dealing with and the bill that provided for the transfer of the prohibition functions to the Department of Justice. Meanwhile, however, it would seem the committee has had a golden opportunity of working effectively along other lines.

We are often reminded that all investigations of official irregularities are conducted by the Senate. I suppose there is no objection to referring to the Senate now since the idea of comity between the two bodies was eliminated yesterday [laughter], but while the Senate has been actually investigating we have been notified in the House time and time again of supposed misdoings in several departments.

Why, it was charged on the floor here two or three months ago that there is such a condition in the Post Office Department with respect to leasing post-office accommodations. The charge has been made that there are irregularities in the Shipping Board. Other similar charges have been made.

I would like now to suggest to the able chairman and to his able colleagues that they should keep in contact with the departments and other agencies, and particularly with the Comptroller General, so that the House of Representatives may take part in finding out what wrongs, if any, there are, and what remedies should be applied.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say to the gentleman that the committee has already undertaken some investigations, but we are not as good at publicity as they are over on the Senate side and we have not been getting much credit in that way for our work. Let me say further that within the last two years the committee has helped to put a stop to a number of irregularities that existed in the Government service.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I wish to reiterate that I have no disposition whatever to be unfairly critical of his committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am simply calling the attention of the House to the tremendous importance of this committee and to the great usefulness of which it is capable if it exerts the authority it possesses. If this is steadily done by the committee I think it will be greatly to the advantage of the Government.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. As one member of the committee I have offered motions in the committee to carry on certain investigations, and in the future I shall again urge that expenditures in the prohibition department be investigated, particularly the Kitty Costello expenditures.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will say to my friend from Wisconsin, that he can not offend me by exerting his efforts in every quarter where there is any possibility at all of any maladministration, where there is any reason to believe that the affairs of the Government are not being properly conducted. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In reply to a statement made by the gentleman from California, I desire to call attention of the committee to paragraph (b) of section 1. Paragraph (b) provides:

(b) Under the direction of the President the administrator of veterans' affairs shall have the power, by order or regulation not inconsistent with law, to consolidate, eliminate, or redistribute the functions of the bureaus, agencies, offices, or activities in the administration of veterans' affairs and to create new ones therein, and, by rules and regulations, shall fix the functions thereof and the duties and powers of their respective executive heads.

That was stricken out on an amendment, and I am going to ask for a separate vote. If the amendment is carried then paragraph (b) remains out. If the noes prevail, then paragraph (b) remains in.

Now, gentlemen, I am doing that not to hamper the committee but to help the committee. I can readily understand that at times contingencies may arise within the committee as to make it necessary for the committee to submit to proposed amendments. But after all it is for the House to decide what should be in the bill and what should go out.

I submit to every sincere friend of the bill seeking to consolidate these veteran activities, that section (b) is absolutely necessary. If you intend to simply create more confusion, more difficulties, more red tape, then the thing to do is to tie the hands of the President in the consolidation of these activities.

But if you desire to cut the red tape, if you desire to give the veterans the service they are entitled to, then by all means permit paragraph (b) to remain in the bill by voting "no."

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. BEEDY. As one member of the committee, I was not present when any agreement was made in regard to paragraph (b); but I think it is indispensable to the purposes we set out to accomplish, and I shall vote to keep it in the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I do not desire to state what occurred in the committee, but I never have agreed to the elimination of paragraph (b).

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the gentleman, also a member of the committee, intends to vote to retain it in the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Absolutely.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thank the gentleman. Consolidation seems to be the object of the bill, that being so, the bill must give the President the latitude and power to enable him to effect a real consolidation and establish the machinery necessary to efficiently carry out and administer the laws affecting our veterans.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLEOD: Page 7, line 10, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) That in order to consolidate certain outstanding obligations of the Government under the World War adjusted compensation act, provide for greater economy and justness in administration, and secure the Government against unjust and extravagant demands, and notwithstanding any provision of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, the administrator of veterans' affairs, upon application

by a veteran in whose name has been issued an adjusted-service certificate, said veteran showing himself to be in actual urgent need of financial assistance, is hereby authorized and directed to pay immediately to such veteran the full face value of his adjusted-service certificate; and the administrator of veterans' affairs is hereby authorized to make suitable regulations for the administration of this section in order to pay as promptly as possible the above-mentioned benefits, giving preference as far as practicable in proportion to the urgency of the need of the applicants.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not exceeding \$50,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section for the current fiscal year."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to section 7 or to the bill itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD].

#### POINT OF ORDER ARGUMENT

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, one of the provisions of my amendment provides for the payment of the face value of adjusted-service certificates to those veterans who show by their applications that they are in most needy circumstances. The question may arise, How is the bureau to determine the degree of need in the case of any particular veteran? This is a matter to which the Director of the Veterans' Bureau has evidently given considerable detailed thought, as shown by his statement which appears on page 3 of the annual report of the director, as follows:

The director has also publicly proposed that consideration be given to the adoption of a new policy of making actual need an important factor in the awarding of benefits. In the opinion of the director such consideration is particularly indicated at this time by reason of the constantly increasing expenditures for veterans' relief coupled with the urge for further liberalization of existing laws. If actual need were made an important factor in the award, it is thought by the director that it would more nearly meet with the universal approval of the public and the Congress.

It is particularly appropriate to inaugurate this new policy at this time when the distress among veterans is largely due to unemployment which is in no way the fault of the veterans themselves. Unemployment, in my opinion, ought to be and logically would be one of the factors in determining actual need. The fact that a veteran has an outstanding loan against his certificate would undoubtedly be another factor in determining actual need. And many other circumstances would be considered. The Veterans' Bureau seems to be prepared to administer benefits on this basis and, in fact, has asked Congress to consider putting all benefits on this basis.

One of the objections to any proposal for benefits to the veterans is the cost. Congress can not make appropriations even for the most worthy object, as this is, without considering the effect on the Treasury. But in this case it is merely a question of determining when we are going to pay what we are absolutely obligated and have agreed to pay eventually. We are merely choosing whether we are to pay the veterans now, while they are living but in need, or whether we continue to hold the money in the Treasury until 1945. My proposition is that we begin paying these obligations now to the most needy veterans as rapidly as we can without increasing taxes. That is the basis of my proposal and the reason for placing the figure at \$50,000,000 for the first or current year's program. This proposal has met with the unanimous approval of the veterans themselves through their organizations. This fact should be borne in mind: Once an adjusted-service certificate is paid, the obligation is ended and the Treasury is relieved of any future charge on that account. There is now in the adjusted-service fund approximately \$634,000,000 in United States Government bonds and other interest-bearing obligations, which forms the reserve for the payment of adjusted-service certificates as they become due, either by death claims or maturity. If a proportion of the certificates are paid now, it simply means that the reserve for that portion can be used for immediate cash payment. The drain on the Treasury will be negligible as compared to the amount of good that will be done by putting this money into circulation at the present time, especially in view of the needy circumstances of many of the veterans.

#### GERMANENESS

The Williamson bill is a consolidation bill which creates a new office and imposes upon the head of the new office certain duties intended to improve the service rendered to veterans by the Government. (See powers under sec. 1 (b) of the bill.)

The bill revises the methods of administering relief for veterans already provided by Congress. My amendment simply pro-

vides for one additional change in the method of administration of a relief already granted. It is therefore germane to the whole bill and the purpose of the bill.

A general subject may be amended by individual propositions. (Hinds' Precedents, vol. 5, secs. 5838, 5839.)

Reasons for the rule of germaneness. (Vol. 5, sec. 5860.)

Whether or not an amendment be germane should be judged from the provisions of its text rather than from the purposes which circumstances may suggest. (Vol. 5, secs. 5783, 5803.)

#### SECTION 5803

On January 15, 1901 (56th Cong., pp. 1052-1054), the rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 13189) was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, proposed an amendment appropriating a sum of money for the construction of three reservoirs at the headwaters of the Missouri River—

"For the purpose of holding back the flood waters of said stream, with a view of minimizing the formation of bars and shoals and other flood-formed obstructions to navigation, and to aid in the maintenance of an increased depth and uniform flow of water for navigation during the dry season."

Mr. Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, made the point of order that the amendment was not germane to the bill, since the means proposed could not affect navigation but rather related to the improvement of arid lands.

"The Chair holds that as the amendment is framed it is germane to the subject matter of the bill and to the subject matter over which the Rivers and Harbors Committee has jurisdiction. Now, whether that correctly presents the facts of the case is to be determined on the merits. But as the amendment is presented and read by the Clerk it appears to the Chair that it is entirely proper and germane to the bill, and therefore the Chair will overrule the point of order."

It will be noted that two things are involved here: Germaneness to the subject matter of the bill and germaneness to the subject matter over which the committee which reported the bill has jurisdiction.

The subject matter of the Williamson bill is:

(a) Consolidation of the activities of the Government for the benefit of veterans.

(b) Granting of new powers to the head of a new executive office for the purpose of granting more efficient and expeditious relief to veterans.

Germaneness of my amendment:

Deals with outstanding obligations of the Government to veterans, and its effect would be to consolidate many of these accounts and close them.

(b) It revises a power already vested in the Director of the Veterans' Bureau—part of subject matter of the bill—in order to grant more expeditious relief, and it would also be more efficient relief as it would apply relief first where and when it is most needed.

Therefore germaneness to the bill is established on both points.

Germaneness to the subject matter over which the committee has jurisdiction.

Quoting from the Rules of the House (House Manual, p. 305):

The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, and commissions of the Government and the manner of keeping same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with the appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The germaneness of the amendment to the subject matter over which the committee has jurisdiction is, therefore, evident from its terms.

Quoting from Hinds' Precedents (vol. 5, sec. 5910):

On January 31, 1899 (3d sess., 55th Cong., p. 1323), the bill (H. R. 11022) for the reorganization of the Army was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and Mr. William Hepburn, of Iowa, offered as a new section or paragraph prescribing frequent target practice by enlisted men and providing for the giving of medals for the best records.

Mr. James Hay, of Virginia, made the point of order that the amendment was not germane to the bill.

After debate the Chairman overruled the point of order.

The amendment:

Insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That the commanding officers of regiments and companies of Infantry and Cavalry shall strive to secure the greatest possible effi-



ciency in the use of firearms by the enlisted men. To this end there shall be frequent target practice, in which all enlisted men shall participate, and the record of efficiency of every enlisted man shall be preserved and at the end of each year shall be forwarded to the Secretary of War, who shall present to the enlisted man who has the best record in his regiment for excellence in the use of firearms a gold medal, with appropriate inscription, and a silver medal to the enlisted man who has the best record in his company."

The point of order was stated as follows:

Mr. HAY. It provides for a system of merit, and so forth, which is not contemplated in the bill in any way, and, moreover, target practice is now provided for by law, and this is an amendment, so far as I can understand, which is in contradistinction to the existing law. (55th Cong., 3d sess., p. 1324.)

The points of identity between the above case and the present are these:

First. Here is a bill for the reorganization of an entire Government department of function, the same as the present bill.

Second. The amendment is made by adding a new section or paragraph.

Third. The amendment affected something which the executive officers were already required by law to do (hold target practice), but revised the time and manner of doing it.

On one point the amendment in the above case goes much farther than my amendment. Notice that in an Army reorganization bill the Hepburn amendment was held germane when it inaugurated something entirely new—a merit system for marksmanship—and provided for the giving of gold and silver medals to certain soldiers.

My amendment gives nothing new to the veterans. The obligations which it directs shall be paid are valid obligations which are now outstanding against the Government, and each and every one of these obligations must be paid some time or other.

Under the present law this duty rests upon the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to pay the certificates, either upon the death of the veteran to whom issued or upon the date of the maturity stated upon the face of the certificate. My amendment would revise this to require the new director of veterans' affairs, whose office would be created by this bill to take over the duties of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, to pay these adjusted-service obligations, beginning immediately and in certain specified order.

Therefore you must agree with me that the precedent established by the Hepburn amendment is even broader than is necessary to show the germaneness of my amendment. In fact, the above ruling would go even farther, and permit me to say, by amendment, that the new director should give a gold medal to each veteran of a certain description, if it was desired to do so.

I think it has been conclusively shown that perhaps the major trouble with the Veterans' Bureau is that there are too many clerks drawing salaries out of the money appropriated to take care of the veterans. Therefore if we could figure up what we can reasonably expect to pay for bookkeeping and upkeep of the Veterans' Bureau for the next 10 years and divide that amount up among the veterans now, more than likely they could take that amount of money and take care of themselves better for the rest of their lives than the Government will do by continuing to maintain this expensive establishment or a successor to it. The less bookkeeping and compensation red tape we have the more money will go directly to the veterans and the better off we will all be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would change the law relating to the method of payment and the amount of payment of World War adjusted compensation. If the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan were introduced as a separate bill, the Chair thinks that under the rule it would have to be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee reporting this bill would have no jurisdiction of it. For that reason, among others, the Chair is of opinion that the amendment is not germane, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have an amendment which I want to offer.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota that all debate upon the section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, something has been said here about some agreement on the part of the Committee on Expenditures to the effect that they would not oppose the amendment to strike out subsection (b) of section 1 of the bill, and that they would not ask for a vote to restore it. "I am a member of this committee. I know of no such agreement. I was present at no meeting where any such agreement was made."

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SWING. The gentleman certainly does not desire to intimate to the House that nothing of the kind took place?

Mr. DALLINGER. Not at all.

Mr. SWING. The gentleman merely desires to say that he was not present.

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly. I know nothing about it. I say further, for the benefit of the Members of the House, that I consider subsection (b) vital to this bill. This is the first attempt at doing something toward reorganizing the executive departments of the Government. There has been a great deal of talk for years about that. Both of the presidential candidates in the last presidential campaign had much to say about the necessity for reorganizing the executive departments.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I am sorry, but I have not the time. The late President Harding recommended that this be done in one of his messages, and a special committee of experts was appointed. Subsequently, a joint committee of the House and Senate was appointed to consider the matter. They brought in an elaborate plan of reorganization. The matter never came before the House because just as soon as the report was made public every bureau chief, every department head and Cabinet officer who was affected commenced to lobby against it. In a faint way we have had the same situation in regard to this bill, which proposes to consolidate into one activity three separate activities which deal with veterans' affairs, and although the President desired this legislation the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions appeared before the committee to oppose it.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I am sorry but I have not the time. It is the same experience that we had when we tried to put through a general plan for reorganization. Mr. Chairman, this committee, which has been unfairly criticized by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], has been working on this question of reorganizing the executive departments of the Government, and it now brings in one measure which deals with veterans' affairs, involving the expenditure of one quarter of our entire budget. This bill should meet with favorable consideration, and I trust that when the request is made for a separate vote on the amendment which struck out subsection (b) of section 1, the Members will vote down that amendment, and pass the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLEOD: Page 7, line 10, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 8. The director of veterans' affairs is hereby authorized and directed to continue and expand the present employment service for veterans conducted by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau and he shall be authorized to expend for this purpose any unexpended portions of appropriations for the administration of veterans' affairs, for whatever purpose they may have been appropriated."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to section 7 or to any part of the bill. It is very clear that it is not. This bill does not seek to change substantive law at all. All we do is to bring these three activities together and put them under one head. We are not dealing with the problems of the Veterans' Bureau or the Pension Bureau. We leave the law as it is. The amendment proposed seeks to amend the law in a manner which would not even be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McLEOD. For just a moment. I read from the 1929 report of the United States Veterans' Bureau. The gentleman suggested that the existing law now provided for the thing that this amendment takes care of. I read from the report:

The director has also publicly proposed that consideration be given to the adoption of a new policy of making actual need an important factor in the awarding of benefits.

That can not be done under existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If the gentleman had read the report thoroughly he would have seen that that statement has no reference to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would change the substantive law. The bill before the committee simply provides for changes in the administrative department and does not provide for changing the substantive law. The Chair therefore is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane, and sustains the point of order.

Under the rule, the reading of the bill having been completed and no further amendments being offered, the committee automatically rises and reports the bill to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the committee.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HALE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10630) to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans, reported that that committee had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the committee, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered on the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote on the Gasque amendment, striking out paragraph (b) of section 1.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Speaker will submit the other amendments in gross.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is some time since we had this amendment before us. I understand the Gasque amendment strikes out paragraph (b) of section 1. If the amendment is voted down, the paragraph remains in the bill, and if the amendment is sustained the paragraph goes out of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The question now is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the Gasque amendment. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of subsection (b) of section 1.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, does an affirmative vote mean the retention of the paragraph in the bill?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair was not present at the time the amendment was offered. He understands that the amendment is to strike out the paragraph. A vote "yea" means to strike out the paragraph; a vote "nay" means to leave it in. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with instructions to the committee to report the same back forthwith, with the following amendment: Strike out the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 190, noes, 61.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. EVANS of Montana, at the request of Mr. LEAVITT, was granted leave of absence, for three days, on account of an official visit to the Naval Academy.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of next week, after the disposition of bills on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of Mother's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, it is very uncertain what business will be before the House next week, and it will be necessary to object to any special request until we get the tariff and two or three other important matters out of the way. For that reason I shall have to object.

Mr. LETTS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SNELL. I will reserve the right to object.

Mr. LETTS. I have been requested to make an address on Mother's Day. Mother's Day is the Sunday following. I would like to have proper time for that.

Mr. DYER. I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] should object.

Mr. SNELL. If we get our regular work out of the way, I shall not object. Until the work is out of the way I must object. The gentleman can get in during the middle of next week if the regular business is finished.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

#### EXCURSION TO THE GRAND CAVERNS

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked several times about the excursion on May 4 to the Grand Caverns, in Virginia. I wish to say that this is a special congressional train, and all Members may go. They may take members of their families; they may take their secretaries, and, those for whom it is proper, may take their sweethearts. The train leaves Union Station at 8 o'clock Sunday morning. It will reach the Grand Caverns, in the Shenandoah Valley, at 12:30. Luncheon will be served there and you will then be conducted through the matchless caverns, a veritable wonderland of beauty and charm; and at 3:30 the train will leave for the eastern side of the Blue Ridge, at Charlottesville. There you will be taken to see Monticello, the famous home of Thomas Jefferson. Also, I understand, you will be given an opportunity to visit the University of Virginia. Dinner will be served in the evening, and the train will return to Washington at 10:55.

Please understand that while it is a special congressional train, you may take the members of your family and your secretaries, but it will not be a train for the general public.

The management of the excursion must know by 10 o'clock to-morrow morning whether you are going. They have asked me to ask you to telephone National 6176, giving the number in your party.

The trip will cost \$5, a special excursion rate. I notice the folder says "plus charge for Pullman accommodations." I am not authorized to say what charge that will be. The round trip is \$5, and that will include luncheon and dinner in the evening and the trip through the caverns and a trip to Monticello, as well as a trip to the grounds of the University of Virginia.

The Members who think that Virginia just extends along the swamps down on the western side of the Potomac River and along Chesapeake Bay should come down and see Virginia at her best in the beauty and glory of the Shenandoah Valley and the Piedmont Valley. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. May we take our children with us?

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Yes; I understand any member of the family can go on this excursion.

#### MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the permission given me by the unanimous consent of the House enables me to give to the people of my district, in a brief way, my record while I have been a Member of Congress.



Since I first came to Congress, I have striven to respond promptly to every reasonable request made of me by my constituents, making it a rule to promptly answer all letters and inquiries, and whenever possible to try to carry out their wishes. This has necessarily increased my work, but I have always felt that my first duty was to the people of my district. The people who have been served by me are the best witnesses as to whether or not my services as a Member of Congress have been satisfactory, and it is for them to say whether I shall continue to serve them. While I have felt that my primary duty was to the people of my district, I have tried faithfully to serve my State and Nation, and to measure up to the high ideals of a national representative.

Ever since I have been in Congress the Republican Party has had control of the Executive and both branches of Congress, and while this has handicapped my effort greatly, yet I have given constant attention to my duties in the Congress and before the committees and in the various departments and in services rendered my constituents, and they are the best judges of how successful I have been.

I am sure the ex-service men will verify the statement when I say that I have been vigilant in season and out of season to advance their interests. The greatest tragedy of all times was the World War. It left behind many heartaches, many sorrows, many "vacant chairs" in the homes, and many human wrecks and disabled men who participated in it in defense of

the American flag. I have always felt that our country owed these brave boys and their dependents every consideration, and I have worked for and voted for every measure in Congress to take care of these boys and their dependents in a most liberal way. The many thousands of veteran cases I have handled from time to time have been a pleasure to me, as I have felt that this part of my work was "a labor of love." I have been helpful in every way possible for the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

The waterway development brought about in North Carolina, and particularly in my district, has been most gratifying. Liberal appropriations have been spent in waterway improvements, and I am giving the amounts spent in North Carolina for river and harbor improvement for the various years. These improvements have been secured in conjunction with the other members of the delegation. I have always worked for and voted for these improvements, and the Congress and the Government have been liberal to our State in this particular. These improvements are just the beginning of the opening up of our ports and the full utilization of our waterways for the progress of our great State. These figures given are for the whole State, for there is such a tying together of these various improvements that to get the full picture the various amounts spent in North Carolina should be considered. The table following shows these amounts during the fiscal years 1922 to 1929:

Statement showing allotments to river and harbor projects in the State of North Carolina during the fiscal years 1922 to 1929

	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.	\$240,000	\$400,000	\$371,500	\$447,000	\$755,000	\$625,000	\$710,000	\$842,500
Meherrin River, N. C.		2,000	2,500	3,000		2,700	3,000	2,000
Roanoke River, N. C.			2,500	3,000		2,700	4,951	3,000
Scuppernon River, N. C.	15,000			14,627		2,700	3,000	2,500
Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, N. C.			5,000	2,000				10,000
Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.						2,500		
Famlico and Tar Rivers, N. C.	21,400	12,000		18,250	10,200	16,500	21,974	45,000
Neuse River, N. C.	12,000	12,000	9,000	18,250	10,200	6,500	49,106	
Contentnea Creek, N. C.	1,600		1,000		1,200	1,500		800
Trent River, N. C.	2,500		4,000	2,500	800	750	3,577	1,200
Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.				5,000				4,000
Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	24,000	16,500	7,500	16,250	17,500	9,200	156,840	10,500
Waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	2,500	30,000	3,500	7,100	4,000		5,102	
Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C.	20,000	10,187		11,650			790,490	655,000
Morehead City Harbor, N. C.			5,000			5,000		
Beaufort Inlet, N. C.				500		65,870	26,249	28,000
Harbor of Refuge, Cape Lookout, N. C.						3,000		
Swift Creek, N. C.	800				800			
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	250,000	200,000	430,000	329,400	245,000	171,000	184,000	150,000
Cape Fear River, N. C., above Wilmington	15,000	12,000	40,000	9,500	6,000	12,000	28,798	
Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.	3,000	3,000	8,500	4,000	2,000	4,000		
Black River, N. C.	2,000	2,000	7,500	3,000	1,600	1,100		1,000
Shallotte River, N. C.							11,444	
Waccamaw River, N. C. and S. C.		10,000	3,000	8,500		3,600	2,000	1,000
Mackay Creek, N. C.								1,800
Operating and care of inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.	28,500	40,000	32,700	47,500	49,500	45,515	52,500	84,000
Operating and care of locks and dams on Cape Fear River, N. C.	13,600	10,500	3,000	22,000	2,500	7,000	11,000	7,500
Total	651,900	760,187	936,200	973,027	1,106,300	988,135	2,064,040	1,849,800

The waterway projects as they affect my district authorized in the pending river and harbor bill which passed the House a short while ago are as follows:

Project for dredging Gallants Channel from Beaufort to the junction with the inland waterway and the Bulkhead Channel from Beaufort to deep water inside of Beaufort Inlet to a depth of 12 feet at mean low water and a width of 100 feet, and the dredging of the channel in front of Beaufort to a depth of 12 feet at mean low water, with widths varying from 200 to 400 feet, \$55,000.

Morehead City Harbor, in accordance with House Document No. 105, Seventieth Congress, to provide for a channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide from deep water in Beaufort Outer Harbor to Sixth Street, Morehead City, thence 200 to 400 feet wide to Tenth Street, and for a channel 6 feet deep and 75 feet wide connecting the western end of the harbor with Bogue Sound.

There will also be authorized in the bill the following surveys looking to the improvement of the following streams:

Mill Creek at Pollocksville, N. C.

Alligator Creek, N. C., and channel connecting said creek with the inland waterway.

Neuse River, N. C., from the wharves at New Bern to Goldsboro, N. C., with a view to providing a depth of 8 feet, with suitable width.

Channel from Core Sound to Ocracoke Inlet, N. C., by way of Wainwright Channel or some other inside passage.

Channel from Beaufort Inlet, N. C., via the inland waterway and Neuse River to New Bern with a view to securing a depth of 20 feet, with suitable width.

Inland waterway from Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C., leading from Craigs Point and via Salliers Bay, Howard Bay, and New River.

Channel from Famlico Sound near the mouth of Neuse River to Beaufort, N. C., via Swan Point, Cedar Island Bay, Thoroughfare Cut, Thoroughfare Bay, Core Sound, touching at Atlantic Wharves, and to run through Mill Point Shoal, by Sealevel, across to Piney Point, and touching the wharves of the various communities through the straits and Taylors Creek Cut, with a view of securing a depth of 7 feet, with suitable width.

Northeast River, N. C.

Waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.

I have had pending before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors the question of a 30-foot channel at Beaufort Inlet, and also the question of the further improvement and completion of the harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout.

I was also interested in the project which was adopted in the rivers and harbors bill in regard to the inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in accordance with report submitted in Senate Document No. 23, Seventy-first Congress, first session, for a tidal lock in the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal at or near Great Bridge, Va., at a limit of cost, however, of not to exceed \$500,000, conditioned upon contributions from local interests in the amount of \$100,000.

As to the development of a great port at Beaufort Inlet I have been working on this matter for a number of years. This development would mean much to the State of North Carolina. There should, and I believe, will be a great port in the future at Beaufort and Morehead City with a 30-foot channel with great shipping lines connecting with foreign ports and with the various ports of the United States. There will be in the future a great port at Cape Lookout. I expect also a great port at Wilmington with a 30-foot channel to the sea. I have been

working for all these waterway and port developments which mean so much to our great State.

Since my tenure in office many important matters have been considered by the Congress, and my voting record in the House is open to all the people for inspection; and any of my constituents who are so minded can secure the information as to how I have stood on all important questions affecting the American people, and particularly the people of my district and my State.

The great problems confronting North Carolina at the present are cheap transportation and the question of taxation and farm relief.

Our waterway development and the building of many miles of hard surface and dependable highways has aided very materially in lessening the costs of transportation so vital to the people. The Government has spent millions in the development of waterways and harbor improvements for our State. Our people must utilize these waterways and harbors more in the future if they expect to get the fullest benefits from these improvements. The Government has spent in conjunction with the State many millions for road improvements.

While the question of taxation of land and personal property has been a matter to be regulated by the legislature, yet I think I have worked out a plan whereby I can get aid for the various counties of the State by a bill which I have introduced in Congress whereby I provide for the return of one-half of the tobacco taxes collected by the Government to the various States to be used for roads and schools. I have mailed to my constituents a copy of this bill and the speech I made in Congress concerning it, and the matter is fully explained therein. The securing of the passage of this bill means a long and hard fight, which I do not mind if the results can be accomplished. The passage of this bill would solve the tax problem in North Carolina.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have worked for and voted for every farm relief measure offered which had for its purpose the benefit of the farmer. The farmer's problems are many and varied. It has always been my aim and purpose in the past to help work them out. I have earnestly striven to do so. I shall continue to work to this end.

I feel that I have been of benefit to the many truck growers and shippers in my district in aiding them in working out better railroad schedules and in their fight for express refrigeration service. I have worked with the Interstate Commerce Commission and with others in bringing about better conditions. Those who have received the benefits know what has been done.

A reading of the items set forth in the indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herein printed gives to my constituents a general idea of the legislation in which I have been interested. The establishment of Moores Creek National Military Park, the securing of the Fort Macon Military Reservation to the State without cost, the passage of the bill for the erection of the monument to Vice President William Rufus King at Clinton, his birthplace, these and many other activities too numerous to mention, give to my constituents some idea of my services in Congress. The establishment of many rural mail services and extensions secured by my efforts have been of benefit to the people. The additions to the Federal building at Goldsboro and the securing of a new Federal building at New Bern, soon to be erected, and improved quarters for post offices in the various towns of my district have engaged my most serious attention and efforts.

It is impossible for me to recount in this speech the various activities in which I have been engaged in my congressional capacity.

I take this opportunity, in view of my inability to visit the various communities of my district, to bring to the attention of my constituents that I expect to be a candidate for renomination in the primaries on June 7, 1930. We have been in constant session here in Congress to such an extent that I could not leave Washington to canvass my district on account of my official duties here.

Suffice it to say that I am relying upon my record for a continuation of my tenure in office, fully believing that my constituents will not only renominate me on June 7 but will reelect me in November.

The work of a Member of Congress which is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is but a small part of his record. The major portion of his work has to do with the various departments and activities of the Government, but I feel that it will be of interest to give to my constituents a brief résumé of my work, as can be found by reference to the indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

(See vol. 64, pt. 6, Index, p. 9)

ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).  
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by  
Morehead City, N. C.: for examination and survey of harbor in (see bill H. R. 14257), 3287.

ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Neuse River: providing for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 13681), 1347.  
North River, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 14291), 3444.

Motions and resolutions offered by

Brinson, Samuel M.: for eulogies on (see H. Res. 524), 1272, 3466.

Petitions and papers presented by, from

Citizens and individuals, 2356.  
Societies and associations, 3173, 3287, 4723.

Remarks by, on

Agricultural appropriation bill, 878, 2506.  
—market news service, 2520.  
Brinson, Samuel M.: death of, 3466.  
British debt settlement, 3286, 3357-3362.  
Cotton, 3586.  
Customs Service reorganizations, 5410.  
District of Columbia appropriation bill: Board of Children's Guardians, 1436.  
—schools and playgrounds, 1382.  
Foreign Service, 3164, 3168, 3169, 3170, 3269.  
Joint Commission of Gold and Silver Inquiry, 5528.  
Market news service: letter from North Carolina State College regarding, 2520.  
Memorial to women of World War, 5543.  
Nitrate of soda and calcium arsenate, 1850, 1851.  
Radio, 2340, 2341, 2343, 2346, 2352, 2353, 2788.  
Rural credits, 4584.  
Second deficiency appropriation bill, 1596, 1598.  
Transportation problem, 2026.  
Von Ezdorf, Rudolph H.: relief of widow, 4141, 4142.  
War Department appropriation bill: rivers and harbors, 2026, 2072.  
Workmen's compensation, 2204, 2208.

(See vol. 65, pt. 12, Index, p. 9)

ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Address at unveiling tablet on Francis Scott Key Bridge by, 6818.  
Appointed on committees, 334.  
Appointed teller, 3183.

Amendments offered by, to

Leavenworth Penitentiary: bill (S. 794) to equip, for manufacturing Government supplies, 1708.

Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Battle field of Moores Creek, N. C.: to establish a national military park (see bill H. R. 9381), 9242.

Beaufort Harbor, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 4578), 571.

Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 4578), 571.

Beaufort, N. C.: for examination and survey of certain channels in inland waterway at (see bill H. R. 7704), 3741.

—to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 5347), 911.

Clinton, N. C.: to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 5342), 911.

Clubfoot Creek, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 4577), 571.

Drafts, checks, notes, and conveyances: to repeal stamp tax on (see bill H. R. 4094), 476.

Ezdorf, Rudolph von: for relief of widow (see bill H. R. 8943), 7428.

Fort Macon Military Reservation: granting to State of North Carolina (see bill H. R. 7145), 2868.

Goldsboro, N. C.: to enlarge public building at (see bill H. R. 5345), 911.

King, William Rufus: to erect monument to (see bill H. R. 8544), 5992.

Mill Cut, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 4577), 571.

Morehead City, N. C.: for examination and survey of harbor in (see bill H. R. 4402), 482.

—to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 6075), 1358.

Mount Olive, N. C.: to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 5343), 911.

Neuse River, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 4403), 482.

New Bern, N. C.: to enlarge public buildings at (see bill H. R. 5346), 911.

Newport River, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 8469), 5709.

North River, N. C.: for examination and survey of (see bill H. R. 8468), 5709.

Scott, Walter L., and others: for relief (see bill H. R. 6994), 2474.

Warsaw, N. C.: to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 5343), 911.

Waters, James B.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 6085), 1358.

Petitions and papers presented by, from

Citizens and individuals, 681, 874, 977.  
Societies and associations, 316, 874, 912, 1908.

Remarks by, on

Agricultural appropriation bill, 6915.  
—boll weevil, 6908.  
Agricultural commodities: McNary-Haugen bill, 9928.  
Alaska fish protection, 5978.  
Alaska: game animals and birds, 11044.  
Attorneys for naval oil lease suits, 1576.  
Battle of Kings Mountain, 7578.  
Bronze tablet on Francis Scott Key Bridge, 1230.  
Cape Cod Canal, 8472, 8480, 8487.  
Child labor amendment, 7167.  
Coast Guard for law enforcement, 4045.  
District of Columbia appropriation bill, 7961.  
Employment of Federal prisoners, 1708, 1709.  
Finland's debt settlement, 1868.  
Foot-and-mouth disease, 6716.  
France's debt to United States, 1869.  
Fraudulent sale of securities, 4529.  
Gasoline tax, 1560, 1565.  
Higgins, Fannie M., 4690.  
Hungary's debt settlement, 8392.  
Inactive committees, 1237.  
Indiana judicial districts, 1342.



## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

## Remarks by, on

Inland Waterways Corporation, 8721, 8722, 8730, 8731, 8733, 8735.  
 Interior Department appropriation bill, 859.  
 — land offices, 1275, 1287.  
 — national parks, 1655.  
 King, William Rufus: tribute to, 6022.  
 Kitchen, Claude: death of, 781.  
 McNary-Haugen bill propaganda, 8080.  
 Mellon tax plan propaganda, 1891.  
 North Carolina, 7503, 7504, 7505, 7508, 7509.  
 Order of business, 2800, 9048.  
 Rent Commission, 7378, 7421, 7424.  
 Rules of House, 1004, 1014, 1016.  
 Soldiers' bonus, 4266.  
 Tax-exempt securities, 2018.  
 Tax reduction, 2444, 2450, 2489, 3351.  
 — cigarettes, 3180, 3181, 3183.  
 Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1886.  
 War Department appropriation bill: rivers and harbors, 5189.  
 War Finance Corporation, 2402.  
 Committee on the Public Lands:  
 Quitclaim deed to certain lots in Pensacola, Fla. (H. Rept. 598), 7522.  
 To quiet title to land in Flomaton, Ala. (H. Rept. 340), 4700.  
 Committee on the Territories:  
 Juneau, Alaska (H. Rept. 754), 8557.  
 (See vol. 66, pt. 6, Index, p. 9)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Address on presenting tree planted on National Cathedral grounds in memory of Woodrow Wilson, delivered by, 1229.

## Motions and resolutions offered by

"The American Creed": to print as public document (see H. Res. 396), 1428.

## Petitions and papers presented by, from

Citizens and individuals, 174, 757, 1851.  
 Societies and associations, 4623.  
 State legislatures, 3597, 5255.

## Remarks by, on

Firearms in mails, 726.  
 Hunter, Reuben R., 557.  
 National parks in southern Appalachian Mountains, 3870.  
 Potash mining, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987.  
 River and harbor bill, 5350.  
 Traffic regulations, 4482.  
 Visa fees, 3989.  
 Ward, Hallett S.: statement by, 1846.

## Reports made by, from

Committee on the Public Lands.  
 Friedman, Samuel (H. Rept. 1205), 1944.  
 Southern Appalachian Mountains National Park (H. Rept. 1320), 2685.

(See vol. 67, pt. 12, Index, p. 9)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Address at annual convention of the Surftman's Mutual Benefit Association, Morehead City, N. C., delivered by, 11717.

Appointed on committees, 932, 933.  
 Address at unveiling of monument to Benjamin May at Farmville, N. C., delivered by, 2413.

## Amendments offered by, to

Second deficiency appropriation bill, 12253.

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Conservation of natural resources publications: to provide for admission as second-class matter certain (see bill H. R. 8717), 3132.

Dennis, Rebecca: to pension (see bill H. R. 12754), 11122.  
 Fulford, R. B.: for relief (see bill H. R. 13190), 12604.  
 Moores Creek, N. C.: to establish national military park at battle field of (see bill H. R. 3796), 448.  
 Neuse River, N. C.: to survey (see bill H. R. 10785), 6483.  
 North River, N. C.: to survey (see bill H. R. 7981), 2404.  
 Nunn, Numa: for relief (see bill H. R. 12809), 11338.  
 Taylor, Julius L.: for relief (see bill H. R. 10830), 6545.

## Motions and resolutions offered by

"The American Creed": to print as public document (see H. Res. 65), 1453.

## Petitions and papers presented by, from

Citizens and individuals, 4528, 6936.

## Remarks by, on

Allen, G. C., 11189.  
 Asphalt, gilsonite, etc., on public domain, 10122.  
 Boulder, Colo., 11031, 11032, 11033, 11034, 11035, 11036, 11037, 11038.  
 Branch banking, 3227, 3229, 11776, 11777, 11915, 11916, 11918, 13091, 13092.  
 Easements in and upon public military reservations, 8783.  
 Enlargement of Capitol Grounds, 11713.  
 Farm relief, 9650, 9653, 9660, 9768.  
 Foreign debt settlements, 11017.  
 Interstate commerce act, 12763.  
 Intracoastal waterways development, 1211.  
 Italian debt settlement, 2079.  
 Knox, Lucy D., 3393.  
 Lottery paraphernalia and gambling devices, 10115, 10116.  
 Milk and cream importation, 12425, 12443.  
 Mining leases on unallotted Indian lands, 11389, 11392.  
 Moores Creek battle ground, 9321.  
 National parks in the East, 12590.  
 Navy Department appropriation bill, 2545, 2546.  
 North Carolina, 1530.  
 North Carolina Smyrna Bay oysters, 4300.  
 River and harbor bill: Illinois River project, 10217, 10218, 10236, 10238, 10654.  
 Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park, 10143, 10145.  
 Second deficiency appropriation bill, 12253.  
 Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountain National Park, 12590.  
 Stedman, Charles M.: birthday of, 2967.  
 Tax reduction, 881, 886, 1010, 1011.  
 Tobacco statistics, 13025.  
 Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1370.  
 Vote on public land bills, 10551, 10552.  
 War Department appropriation bill: rivers and harbors, 3816, 3817.

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

## Reports made by, from

Committee on the Public Lands:

Peoples Investment Co. (Inc.) (H. Rept. 1397), 10883.  
 Shenandoah National Park and Great Smoky Mountains National Park (H. Rept. 1160), 9248.  
 Wilson, Herbert A. (H. Rept. 1077), 8785.  
 (See vol. 68, pt. 6, Index, p. 9)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Attended, 10.

## Amendments offered by, to

Second deficiency appropriation bill, 4874.

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Allen, Will J.: for relief (see bill H. R. 17046), 3398.  
 Hartsfield, Jacob Lemuel: to pension (see bill H. R. 15428), 732.  
 Henderson, George: to pension (see bill H. R. 14934), 337.  
 Naval Academy: relating to admission of candidates to (see bill H. R. 16874), 2744.  
 Paul, Nancy Elizabeth: to pension (see bill H. R. 15957), 1153.  
 Simpson, Ada Daniels: to pension (see bill H. R. 15958), 1153.

## Petitions and papers presented by, from

Citizens and individuals, 4013.

## Remarks by, on

Amending tariff act of 1922, 4253.  
 Challis National Forest, 5134.  
 Chinese question, 2329, 2387, 2389, 2390.  
 Civil war claims, 4921.  
 Construction loan fund, 5938, 5939.  
 Cotton prices, 5434.  
 Court terms in El Dorado division of Arkansas, 5148.  
 Farm relief, 3618, 4035.  
 Fixing place of venue, 5148, 5152.  
 House ventilating system, 2629, 2630.  
 Immigration amendment, 5100, 5437, 5438.  
 Independent offices appropriation bill: merchant marine, 1434.  
 Leary, Samuel E.: service performed by, 1884.  
 Longshoremen's bill, 5403.  
 Moffat Rocky Mountain tunnel, 4181.  
 Moro, A., and Anthony Campbell, 5131.  
 National arboretum, 4245.  
 Navy Department appropriation bill, 1099.  
 — cruisers, 1229, 4692.  
 Oil and gas leases on Indian lands, 4579.  
 Order of business, 5092.  
 Paper pulp from waste matter, 2262.  
 Public lands, 1448.  
 Radio, 2658, 2659.  
 Reapportionment, 5417.  
 River and harbor bill, 1605, 1608, 1614.  
 Second deficiency appropriation bill, 4859, 4874, 4875, 4921, 4945.  
 State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill, 2251, 2252, 2313, 2327, 2333, 2334, 2500.  
 Tax reduction, 2330.  
 Use of mails to defraud, 5152.  
 War Department appropriation bill, 1891.  
 Watersheds of navigable streams, 5609, 5610, 5611.

## Reports made by, from

Committee on Public Lands.

Moro, A., and Anthony Campbell (H. Rept. 2025), 3397.  
 Steadham, Moses (H. Rept. 1701), 1256, 1406.  
 (See vol. 69, pt. 11, Index, p. 9)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Appointed on committees, 493.

Address on the question of farm relief delivered by, 2085.

Radio address on the subject of farm relief by, 10767.

Radio address on the work of the first session of the Seventieth Congress delivered by, 10147.

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Alligator Creek: to survey (see bill H. R. 9486), 1639.  
 Brady, James B. P.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 11537), 3737.  
 Dennis, Rebecca: to pension (see bill H. R. 10091), 2111.  
 Fulford, R. B.: for relief (see bill H. R. 7954), 877.  
 Goodwin, Leonard: for relief (see bill H. R. 9690), 1761.  
 Hales, Ernest R.: to pension (see bill H. R. 11538), 3737.  
 Interstate commerce act: to amend so as to eliminate requirement of certificates of public convenience and necessity in respect of construction of new railroad lines, the (see bill H. R. 13113), 6675.  
 King, William Rufus: to erect monument in commemoration of (see bill H. R. 7903), 875.  
 Mill Creek: to survey (see bill H. R. 12251), 5088.  
 Nelson, Leonard Webber: to pension (see bill H. R. 13462), 7589.  
 North Carolina: to survey channel from Beaufort Inlet to New Bern (see bill H. R. 8268), 920.  
 — to survey channel from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort (see bill H. R. 9861), 1911.  
 — for survey of inland waterway from Beaufort to Jacksonville (see bill H. R. 8267), 920.  
 Nunn, Numa: for relief (see bill H. R. 9504), 1639.  
 Outlaw, Willie L.: to pension (see bill H. R. 13062), 6476.  
 Paul, Nancy Elizabeth: to pension (see bill H. R. 6108), 227.  
 Rayner, Hattie W.: for relief (see bill H. R. 9691), 1761.  
 Simpson, Ada Daniels: to pension (see bill H. R. 6459), 232.  
 Washington Parish Burial Ground (Congressional Cemetery): to provide for care and preservation of certain land and monuments in (see bill H. R. 11916), 4447.  
 Willis, Kelly E.: for relief (see bill H. R. 9602), 1761.  
 Wooten, Charles Thomas: for relief (see bill H. R. 7955), 877.

## Remarks by, on

Adjournment over, 3535.  
 Agricultural appropriation bill, 4034.  
 Alien property bill, 758.  
 Blue, Victor: death of, 2022.  
 Boulder Dam, 9491, 9510, 9631.  
 Bridge bills, 839.  
 Condemnation proceedings, 10749.  
 Congressional Cemetery, 5214, 5217, 5218, 5219.  
 Construction at military posts, 4123.

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

## Remarks by, on

Convict-made goods, 8661, 8755, 8756.  
 Copyright fees, 2592.  
 Declaratory judgments, 1683, 2031.  
 District of Columbia appropriation bill, 3485.  
 — schools, 3542, 3543.  
 Farm relief, 7657, 7665, 7669, 10726.  
 Federal Power Commission, 5063, 5064, 5070, 5078.  
 Federal Reserve Bank at Dallas, Tex., 6435.  
 Flood control, 6798.  
 French debt, 3182.  
 Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, 5527.  
 Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 4409.  
 Independent offices appropriation bill, 1886.  
 — merchant marine, 1965.  
 Inland Waterways Corporation, 8761, 8762, 8763, 8998.  
 Interior Department appropriation bill, 1413.  
 Interurban railway decision, 8124.  
 Invitation to eat oysters, 3262.  
 Jones, Andreus A.: death of, 6484.  
 King, William Rufus: monument to, 3281, 3282.  
 Legislative appropriation bill, 6430, 6462, 6463, 6468, 6473, 6418, 6419.  
 Legislative program—Calendar Wednesday, 5073, 5078.  
 Magee, Walter W.: death of, 6479.  
 Marines in Nicaragua, 5467.  
 Merchant marine, 5258, 5262, 7830, 7840, 7841, 7842, 7897, 7914.  
 — national defense, 5226.  
 Mississippi River wild life refuge, 6222, 6225, 6226, 6227, 6229.  
 Muscle Shoals, 8229, 8238.  
 Naval shipbuilding, 4850, 4851, 4854, 4855.  
 Navy Department appropriation bill, 5328, 5467.  
 — dirigibles, 5455, 5461.  
 Nicaragua, 5253.  
 Piedmont & Northern Railway decision, 6704.  
 Pink bollworm, 8557.  
 Practice before Patent Office, 6579.  
 Public buildings, 854.  
 Public-health activities, 4269.  
 Radio regulation, 3873, 3988, 4498, 4579, 4580, 5115, 5116, 5118, 5119.  
 Relief of State of North Carolina, 9991.  
 Retirement of disabled emergency officers, 8346, 8356, 8445, 8455, 8460, 8461, 8462.  
 Rural post roads—veto message, 9992.  
 Tariff, 5517.  
 — farm relief, 3866.  
 Transfer of certain property to city of Duluth, 8565.  
 Veazey, A. H.—agricultural teacher, 5472.  
 Ventilation of the House, 1067.  
 Veterans' legislation, 10150.  
 War Department appropriation bill—rivers and harbors, 2807, 2809.  
 Wilbur, Curtis D.: floor privileges of, 4855.  
 Woodland, James Edward: death of, 6112.  
 Wyoming's Representatives in Congress, 5207.

(See vol. 70, pt. 6, Index, p. 9)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Appointed on committee to participate in historical celebration at New Bern, N. C., 5214.  
 Radio address on the subject of farm-relief legislation delivered by, 3352.

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Cummings, Elizabeth Quinerly: for relief (see bill H. R. 16089), 1451.  
 Dortch, Hugh: for relief (see bill H. R. 16090), 1451.  
 Von Ezdorf, Mary: to pension (see bill H. R. 16452), 2021.

## Motions and resolutions offered by

New Bern, N. C.: for appointment of committee on observance of certain historical events which occurred during Colonial and Revolutionary period at (see H. Con. Res. 52), 2655.

## Petitions and papers presented by

Citizens and individuals, 1708, 1806, 1947.  
 Societies and associations, 3559.

## Remarks by, on

Agricultural appropriation bill, 840, 888, 892, 3242.  
 Anthony, Daniel R.: tribute to, 5235.  
 Battle field of Moores Creek, N. C., 1698.  
 Bird sanctuaries, 3175.  
 Black, Eugene: tribute to, 5235.  
 Blanton, Thomas L.: tribute to, 5235.  
 Congressional Cemetery, 3550.  
 District of Columbia appropriation bill, 2077.  
 First deficiency appropriation bill—tax refunds, 1200.  
 Great Smoky Mountain National Park, 642.  
 Hellenic debt settlement, 350.  
 Independent offices appropriation bill, 1937, 3390, 3391.  
 Interior Department appropriation bill, 642, 643.  
 King, William Rufus, 1700.  
 Life-saving retirement, 4651.  
 Load lines for American vessels, 3960, 3963, 3964, 3972, 4614, 4757, 4758.  
 Morin, John M.: tribute to, 5235.  
 National Institute of Health, 5205, 5206.  
 Navy Department appropriation bill—Puget Sound yard, 3091, 3092.  
 New Bern historical pageant, 4805.  
 Practice of the healing art, 3279, 3280.  
 Reapportionment—exclusion of aliens, 698.  
 Samoan Islands, 3414.  
 Storm and flood areas of South Atlantic States, 3326, 3327, 3328.  
 Toll bridges, 4064.  
 War Department appropriation bill, 1151, 1153, 1154, 1161, 1162, 1698, 1700, 3988.  
 — Inland Waterways Corporation, 1703, 1704.  
 Warrant officers, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, 491, 493.

## SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

(January 28 to February 9, 1929)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

New Bern, N. C.: for appointment of committee on observance of certain historical events which occurred during Colonial and Revolutionary period at (see H. Con. Res. 52), 2655.

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

## Remarks by, on

Bird sanctuaries, 3175.  
 Navy Department appropriation bill: Puget Sound yard, 3091, 3092.  
 Osage Tribe of Indians, 2947.

## SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

(April 15 to April 26, 1929)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Remarks by, on

Farm relief, 145, 164, 194, 560, 2524.  
 — equalization fee, 480, 481.  
 Kerr, John H.: address by, 183.  
 Mediterranean fruit fly, 608.  
 Pilgrimage of gold-star mothers, 185.  
 Refrigeration charges on southern fruits and vegetables, 487.

## SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

(December 2 to December 21, 1929)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

Address on the subject of the New York Stock Exchange and its practices delivered by, 986.  
 Appointed on committees, 234.

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Ipock, Owider, Mrs.: to pension (see bill H. R. 7646), 771.  
 Lincoln, J. Thurman: for relief (see bill H. R. 6885), 271.  
 Nelson, Leonard Webber: to pension (see bill H. R. 7647), 771.  
 Short, Cleveland L.: for relief (see bill H. R. 7415), 574.  
 Washington Parish Burial Ground (Congressional Cemetery): to provide for care and preservation of certain land and monuments in (see bill H. R. 7750), 927.  
 Wells, Keyah: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 7143), 430.

## Remarks by, on

Agricultural appropriation bill, 820, 821, 822.  
 Branch banking, 312, 313.  
 Cotton futures, 686.  
 Diversification of agriculture in North Carolina, 820, 821, 822.  
 Duck hunting in the South, 488.  
 French debt settlement, 554, 555.

(January 6 to January 18, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Willis, Kelly E.: to pension (see bill H. R. 8581), 1616.  
 (January 20 to February 1, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Remarks by, on

George Washington Memorial Parkway, 2723.  
 Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 2409, 2410, 2411.  
 Oleomargarine, 2800, 2806, 2875.

(February 3 to February 15, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Hartsfield, Jacob Lemuel: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 9727), 3405.  
 Waters, James B.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 9642), 3275.

## Remarks by, on

Independent offices appropriation bill: Federal Trade Board, 3689.  
 (February 17 to March 1, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor: to survey waterway connecting (see bill H. R. 10348), 4453.  
 Gaylor, Henry B.: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 10349), 4453.  
 King, William Rufus: to erect monument in commemoration of (see bill H. R. 10171), 4095.

## Remarks by, on

Bills correcting military records, 4449.  
 Business conference, 3877.  
 Farm land banks, 3943, 3944.  
 Fresh fruit and vegetable market practices, 4244, 4245.  
 Gasoline prices, 4313, 4314.  
 LaGuardia, Mr.: remarks of, 4534, 4540.  
 Merchant marine, 4534, 4543, 4544.  
 O'Connor of Louisiana, Mr.: remarks of, 4242.  
 Return of good times, 4079.  
 Seed, feed, and fertilizer loans, 4172, 4174, 4175, 4176, 4181, 4185.

(March 3 to March 15, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Tobacco: to provide for payment to States of amounts equal to part of sums collected as internal-revenue taxes on (see bill H. R. 10622), 5023.

## Remarks by, on

Civil-service retirement, 4745.  
 False reports against banks of Federal reserve, 4834, 4836, 4837.  
 Narcotics, 4980.  
 Tobacco tax, 4961, 4962, 5109, 5110, 5111.

(March 17 to March 28, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Howell, Moody A.: for relief (see bill H. R. 11205), 6193.  
 Northeast River: for survey of (see bill H. R. 11059), 6051.

## Remarks by, on

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 6159, 6160, 6168.  
 — police, 6170.  
 First deficiency appropriation bill: conference report, 5633.  
 Improper practice before Patent Office, 5464, 5465.  
 King, William Rufus, 5469.  
 Motor bus bill, 5552, 5767, 5867, 5868.  
 Public health activities, 6116, 6123.

(March 31 to April 1, 1930)

## ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (a Representative from North Carolina).

## Bills and joint resolutions introduced by

Alligator Creek: to survey (see bill H. R. 11520), 6817.  
 Beaufort Inlet to New Bern: to survey channel from (see bill H. R. 11518), 6817.



ABERNETHY, CHARLES L.—Continued.

*Bills and joint resolutions introduced by*

Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.: to survey inland waterway from (see bill H. R. 11517), 6817.  
Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor: to provide for survey of waterway connecting (see bill H. R. 11516), 6817.  
Lincoln, Ada Vermont: to pension (see bill H. R. 11552), 6912.  
Mill Creek: to survey (see bill H. R. 11521), 6817.  
North Carolina: to survey channel from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort (see bill H. R. 11519), 6817.

*Remarks by, on*

Cash payment of adjusted compensation, 6486.  
Consolidation of veterans' affairs, 6733.  
Equalizing burdens of war, 6323, 6331.  
Press Club spelling bee, 6323, 6324.  
World War veterans' legislation, 6676.

(April 14 to April 25, 1930)

ABERNETHY, CHARLES L. (*a Representative from North Carolina*).  
Address on subject of the North Carolina flag delivered by, 7721.

*Remarks by, on*

Commission to study veterans' legislation, 7634.  
Fisheries 5-year program, 7179, 7183, 7184.  
River and harbor bill, 7742.  
Sale of piers in Hoboken, N. J., 7173, 7175, 7176.  
World War veterans' act, 1924, 7489, 7496, 7497.

PILGRIMAGE OF WIDOWS AND MOTHERS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS TO CEMETERIES OF EUROPE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RANSLEY, of the Committee on Military Affairs, presented the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," for printing.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, following the address of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that following the address of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] he may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, it is understood that this request is under the same restriction as the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, under the same conditions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent that on to-morrow, following the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], he may address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, it is understood that it is all under the condition that Calendar Wednesday business is out of the way?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 4182. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Georgetown, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7356. An act for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3441. An act to effect the consolidation of the Turkey Thicket Playground, Recreation, and Athletic Field.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10379. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the con-

struction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, April 30, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture (S. 2113).

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia (S. 3801).

### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals (H. R. 9599).

### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10.30 a. m.)

To establish a reservoir system of flood control on the tributaries of the Mississippi River (H. R. 9376).

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

430. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Willamette River, Oreg., between Portland and Salem (H. Doc. No. 372); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

431. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on the Fox River, Wis. and Ill., covering navigation, flood control, power development, and irrigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 9673. A bill to authorize the refund of visa fees in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11580. A bill to amend section 1709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1083), and section 304 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24); with amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9433. A bill to amend the Federal farm loan act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEHLBACH: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3249. An act to amend section 4578 of the Revised Statutes of the United States respecting compensation of vessels for transporting seamen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10782. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Roland Zolesky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9659. A bill for the relief of H. F. Frick and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10608. A bill for the relief of R. W. Selvidge; with amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10688) for the relief of Bertha Hymes Sternfeld; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 11161) granting a pension to Hinman E. Ingerson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 12010) to advance on the retired list to the grade temporarily held in time of war any officer of the Coast Guard who has been retired because of physical disability originating in line of duty in time of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12011) to provide for standard methods of grading and valuing cottonseed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 12012) to require a contractor to whom is awarded any contract for public buildings or other public works, or for repairs or improvements thereon, in the District of Columbia to give bond for the faithful performance of the contract, for the protection of persons furnishing labor and materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12013) to revise and equalize the rate of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 12014) to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BEERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) to provide for the printing with illustrations and binding in cloth of 62,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) authorizing an appropriation of \$25,000 to assist in the construction of a highway leading to the Kings Mountain battle field, South Carolina; to the Committee on Roads.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARKE of New York: A bill (H. R. 12015) granting an increase of pension to Malvina H. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12016) granting an increase of pension to Philip Winckler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 12017) granting a pension to Bessie Sneed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 12018) granting a pension to John W. Strausser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDER: A bill (H. R. 12019) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William Zeiss, ad-

ministrator of William B. Reaney, survivor of Thomas Reaney, and Samuel Archbold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 12020) for the relief of Zedic N. Draper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12021) to authorize the appointment and retirement of Evelyn Briggs Baldwin in the grade of captain in the Navy in recognition of his patriotic and scientific services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 12022) for the relief of Southern Overall Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12023) to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lois Cramton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12024) granting a pension to Isaac Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12025) granting a pension to Sarah Frasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12026) granting a pension to Araminta Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12027) granting an increase of pension to Belinda Kanzig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 12028) for the relief of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Marianna, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12029) granting a pension to Clarence D. Hanks; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7155. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, opposing the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar, unless a proviso be attached thereto, definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of the blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7156. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Rock Island Lines, Carnegie, Okla., in support of House bill 10343; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7157. Also, petition of Pearl E. Hughey, postmaster at Cleo Springs, Okla., urging that House bill 229 be made effective as of July 1, 1930, instead of July 1, 1931; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7158. Also, petition of Alaska Native Brotherhood, re conditions of natives of southeast Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

7159. Also, petition of Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La., in support of tariff on lumber, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7160. Also, petition of Izaak Walton League of America, in support of Senate bill 2498 and House bill 6981; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7161. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of the Winona Lake Literary Club urging passage of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7162. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Mrs. William Bergen and 64 other citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of the Capper-Robson school bill, H. R. 10; to the Committee on Education.

7163. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of James H. Ford and 165 other citizens of Stockton, Calif., urging Congress to speedily pass the Manlove bill, H. R. 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

7164. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the American Bandmasters' Association (Inc.), Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 10677, granting commissioned rank to Army bandmasters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7165. By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of residents of Delaware County, Ind., urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

7166. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Henry R. Gay, mayor, and others, of Buckhannon, Upshur County, W. Va., urging Congress to press committee in conference on Senate bill 15, civil service retirement act, and to report same for favorable action by Congress, before adjournment of the present session; to the Committee on the Civil Service.